OXFORD

The Early Text of the New Testament

Charles E. Hill,
Michael J. Kruger

THE EARLY TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

This page intentionally left blank

The Early Text of the New Testament

Edited by

CHARLES E. HILL AND MICHAEL J. KRUGER

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP
United Kingdom
Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

First Edition published in 2012

Impression: 1

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Data available

ISBN 978–0–19–956636–5

Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

Acknowledgements

For a book such as this one, in which many have been involved, there are many who deserve our thanks. We are grateful, first of all, for the privilege of working with the extraordinary group of experts who contributed the chapters to this book. We believe the painstaking labour they have bestowed on the critical topic of the scribal context and early textual history of the New Testament books will bear the fruit of greater understanding for many years to come.

The editors and production staff at Oxford University Press, including Tom Perridge, Lizzie Robottom, Anne Leask, Nicola Sangster, Jane Robson, and others unknown to us, have our thankful admiration for their thoroughness and perseverance through countless communications and revisions. We would like to thank translator Edwin Collado, bibliographer Greg Salazar, indexers Tim Muether, John Muether, David Veldkamp, and Annie Muether, librarians John Muether, Michael Farrell, and Laura Armstrong. We also wish to acknowledge Randy and Linda Randall, benefactors of the Randall Fund, and Burton and Betty McPheeters and Marcy Hill, benefactors of the McPheeters-Hill Fund, whose generosity helped make this project possible.

Finally, to our wives, who, for six and a half years have borne patiently with us through the seemingly unending stream of unforeseen stages of this book, we want to express our deepest appreciation. The long travail is finally over. At least until the next edition.

Contents

Contributors

Tjitze Baarda, Professor Emeritus, Free University, Amsterdam

D. Jeffrey Bingham, Chairman and Professor of Theological Studies, Dallas Theological Seminary

Juan Chapa, Associate Professor of New Testament, Faculty of Theology, University of Navarra

Scott Charlesworth, Senior Lecturer, School of Theology, Pacific Adventist University, Papua New Guinea

Carl P. Cosaert, Assistant Professor of New Testament and Early Christianity, School of Theology, Walla Walla University

J. K. Elliott, Professor Emeritus of New Testament Textual Criticism, University of Leeds

Paul Foster, Senior Lecturer in New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, University of Edinburgh

Harry Y. Gamble, Chairman of the Religious Studies Department and Professor of New Testament Studies and Early Christianity at the University of Virginia

Peter M. Head, Sir Kirby Laing Senior Lecturer in New Testament, Tyndale House and Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge

Juan Hernández, Jr., Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies, Bethel University

Charles E. Hill, Professor of New Testament, Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando, Florida

Larry Hurtado, Emeritus Professor of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, University of Edinburgh

Michael J. Kruger, Professor of New Testament, Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC

Tobias Nicklas, Chair of New Testament Studies, University of Regensburg

Stanley E. Porter, President, Dean, and Professor of New Testament, McMaster Divinity College

Dieter T. Roth, Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz

James R. Royse, Visiting Scholar, Claremont School of Theology

Billy R. Todd, Jr., Ph.D. student in Theological Studies, Dallas Theological Seminary

Christopher Tuckett, Professor of New Testament Studies, University of Oxford

Joseph Verheyden, Professor of New Testament Studies, Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, Catholic University of Leuven

Tommy Wasserman, Researcher at Høyskolen for Ledelse og Teologi, Stabekk, Norway

Peter Williams, Warden, Tyndale House, Cambridge

Abbreviations

Aeg	*Aegyptus*
AGBL	Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel (= Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel). Freiburg: Herder, 1957–)
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.* Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972–
ANTF	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
Anton	*Antonianum*
ANTT	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
APF	*Archiv für Papyrusforschung*
ATR	*Australasian Theological Review*
Aug	*Augustinianum*
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
Bib	*Biblica*
BibS(F)	Biblische Studien (Freiburg, 1895–)
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
ByzNeugr Jb	*Byzantinisch-neugriechischer Jahrbücher*
CADp	Centre d'analyse et de documentation patristiques
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series latina. Turnhout, 1953–
CEBT	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CJA	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
ConBNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica or Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CQ	*Church Quarterly*
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, ed. I. B. Chabot *et al.* Paris, 1903–
CW	*Classical World*
EstBib	*Estudios Bíblicos*
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*

Exp	*Expositor*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
FilNeo	*Filologia Neotestamentaria*
GTT	*Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift*
Herm	*Hermanthena*
HTB	Histoire du Texte Biblique
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
ICC	International Critic Commentary
IGNTP	International Greek New Testament Project
JAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JRH	*Journal of Religious History*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
MPIL	Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute, Leiden
MthSt	Marburger theologische Studien
NA[27]	Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland, 27th edition
NewDocs	*New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, ed. G. H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn (North Ryde, NSW, 1981–)
NedTT	*Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift*
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus

NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OECT	Oxford Early Christian Texts
PapFlor	Papyrologica Florentina
PBA	Proceedings of the British Academy
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. T. Kluser *et al.* (Stuttgart, 1950–)
RB	*Revue biblique*
RE	*Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*
RevScRel	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses*
RHA	*Revue hittite et asianique*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLNTGF	Society of Biblical Literature, The New Testament in the Greek Fathers
SC	Sources chrétiennes (Paris: Cerf, 1943–)
SD	Studies and Documents
SecCent	*Second Century*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SO	*Symbolae osloenses*
SPap	*Studia Papyrologica*
STAR	Studies in Theology and Religion
STP	Studi e testi di papirologia
StPatr	*Studia Patristica*
SSEJC	*Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*
TC	*TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*
TENTS	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie,* ed. G. Krause and G.Müller (Berlin, 1977)
TS	Texts and Studies
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
UBS^4	The Greek New Testament, United Bible Societies, 4th edition
VC	*Vigiliae christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*

WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAC	*Journal of Ancient Christianity*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*
ZWT	*Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*

Introduction

In Search of the Earliest Text of the New Testament

Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger

INTRODUCTION

In 1979, after years of writing about what he called 'The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism', Eldon J. Epp published an even more dismal prognosis for scholars in this field in an article entitled, 'New Testament Textual Criticism in America: Requiem for a Discipline'.[1] Despite Epp's dire analysis, however, or perhaps partly because of it, the discipline slowly began to show signs of a turnaround. By 1999 Larry Hurtado could say that the patient 'may be a bit healthier (particularly in the English-speaking countries) as we near the end of this century'.[2] Now, a decade into the twenty-first century, some might wish to grant the discipline of New Testament textual criticism a clean bill of health.

There is currently an undeniable flowering of interest in many aspects of research on the text and the manuscript tradition of the New Testament documents. One fairly dramatic sign of vitality is the phenomenal success of Bart Ehrman's *Misquoting Jesus*,[3] which introduced, somewhat controversially, the formerly moribund discipline to the popular reading public. And on the other end of the spectrum, highly technical, scholarly volumes having to do in some way with the early transmission of NT documents are swelling

[1] E. J. Epp, 'The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism', *JBL* 98 (1979), 94–8.

[2] L. Hurtado, 'Beyond the Interlude? Developments and Directions in New Testament Textual Criticism', in D. G. K. Taylor, ed., *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 1999), 47.

[3] B. D. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus: The Story behind Who Changed the Bible and Why* (San Francisco: Harper, 2005).

the catalogues of many an academic publisher. The continuing publication of newly edited papyri from Oxyrhynchus generates more interest than ever, particularly as high-resolution photographs and other tools for study have become available to scholars through the Oxyrhynchus website. One of the most spectacular stimulants to the scholar and the general public alike is the recent publication of the entire text of the famous codex Sinaiticus, a codex which has played so large a role in the construction of modern editions of the NT, on a well endowed website.[4]

While these and other developments signify a burgeoning of interest in the history of the NT text, the greatest injection of substantial *new* materials into the textual database for the discipline, and the greatest of several impetuses for this book, has come from the steadily accumulating papyrus and early parchment finds from Egypt. There are now, as we write, 127 catalogued papyri containing some portion of the New Testament writings. These range from large codices to tiny fragments of text. The early date of many of them, before the great uncial codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus of the fourth century, elevates them to an 'automatic' importance in the minds of many textual critics. But, as we shall see below, their real significance for the discipline of NT textual criticism is currently controversial.

While data from the study of these papyri have been mounting, gains have also been made in the understanding of scribal habits and methods of book production and distribution in antiquity. Significant research by Harry Gamble,[5] Kim Haines-Eitzen,[6] Larry Hurtado,[7] and James Royse,[8] among many others, has brought new insights to the attention of scholars dealing with Christian origins.

This growth in new knowledge unavailable to previous generations of scholars has arguably reached a 'critical mass'. As far back as 1989 Kurt and Barbara Aland wrote, 'Although many details are obviously still debatable, there can be no doubt that the earlier view of the textual situation before the rise of the major text types is now due for a radical and thorough review.'[9] With the influx of a substantial amount of new material and newer methods of research since 1989, the time seems ripe to make at least a first attempt at such a review.

The Early Text of the New Testament thus intends to provide an inventory and some analysis of the evidence available for understanding the pre-fourth-century period of the transmission of the NT materials. Any attempt to do this

[4] http://codexsinaiticus.org.

[5] H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

[6] K. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

[7] L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006). See also T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, eds., *New Testament Manuscripts* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006).

[8] J. R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

[9] K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 95.

at the present time, however, must recognize that the traditional conception of the task of NT textual criticism has been actively challenged in the past two decades or so, and for some remains in a state of flux.

EARLY TEXT AND 'ORIGINAL' TEXT

Looming large in discussions over the last generation is the viability and relevance of the concept of an 'original' text.[10] Although the traditional treatments of textual criticism—including those of Hort,[11] Gregory,[12] Kenyon,[13] Lake,[14] Metzger,[15] and the Alands[16]—have generally pursued the goal of recovering the original text, they have offered little sustained treatment about the complexities involved in defining the term. More recent writers have not only begun to raise questions about the meaning of the term, but also about whether establishing the original text should even be the goal of the discipline. Ehrman, commenting on past attempts to recover the original text, declares, 'It is by no means self-evident that this ought to be the goal of the discipline... there may indeed be scant reason to privilege the "original" text over forms of the text that developed subsequently'.[17] Others have been keen to raise concerns about how close we can really get to the 'original' text even if we wanted to do it. Helmut Koester argues that the papyri themselves are at least a century removed from the original publication of the New Testament text and thus provide no real assurance that the earliest text looked anything like our extant papyri.[18] Similar sentiments are expressed by Petersen, Parker, and Epp.[19]

[10] The most detailed overview of the recent debate can be found in E. J. Epp, 'The Multivalence of the Term "Original Text" in New Testament Textual Criticism', *HTR* 92 (1999), 245–81.

[11] B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1881), 2.1.

[12] C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907), 485.

[13] F. G. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1926), 1–2.

[14] K. Lake, *The Text of the New Testament* (London: Rivingtons, 1913), 1.

[15] B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (New York: OUP, 1992), 150.

[16] Aland and Aland, *Text*, 291–2.

[17] B. D. Ehrman, 'The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity', in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 361 n.1. Ehrman's position was anticipated many years earlier by D. W. Riddle, 'Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline', *ATR* 18 (1936): 221; and M. M. Parvis, 'The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal', *JR* 32 (1952): 172.

[18] H. Koester, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 19–37. Differing from Koester are F. Wisse, 'The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions of the Second Century* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1989), 39–53; and J. Delobel, 'The Achilles' Heel of New Testament Textual Criticism', *Bijdragen, International Journal of Philosophy and Theology,* 63 (2002): 3–21.

[19] W. L. Petersen, 'What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?', in B. Aland and J. Delobel, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church*

In a number of ways, the recent attention to the concept of the 'original' text is a welcome development. No doubt the term has been used far too long without appropriate nuance and qualification.[20] Moreover, given the complexities of the textual history of some of the New Testament writings (in particular, Acts), and the limited number of early papyri we possess, we should not be overly confident that our reconstructed critical text is equivalent to what was originally written. Such a cautionary approach has been exemplified by the Metzger-Ehrman volume which does not claim textual critics can recover the original text, *per se*, but rather the text 'regarded as most nearly conforming to the original'.[21] Likewise, the present volume has attempted to strike a cautionary tone in its very title, *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Our concern here is not so much a recovery of the original text, but an analysis of the 'early' text and its transmission.

However, while the complexities in recovering the original text need to be acknowledged, that is a separate question from whether the *concept* of an original text is incoherent and should therefore be abandoned as a goal of the discipline. Unfortunately, these two questions are often mingled together without distinction. Although recovering the original text faces substantial obstacles (and therefore the results should be qualified), there is little to suggest that it is an illegitimate enterprise. If it were illegitimate, then we would expect the same would be true for Greek and Roman literature *outside* the New Testament. Are we to think that an attempt to reconstruct the original word of Tacitus, or Plato, or Thucydides is misguided? Or that it does not matter? Those who argue that we should abandon the concept of an original text for the New Testament often give very little (if any) attention to the implications of such an approach for classical literature. Indeed, Parker gives the impression that concern for the original text is simply a *religious* phenomenon, driven by pressure from churches who desire an 'authoritative text'.[22] It is doubtful that the scholars devoting their careers to recovering the original text of classical works would agree. To them, a text does not have to be sacred for its original wording to matter.

There appears to be little reason, therefore, to relinquish the traditional goal of textual criticism (even if that goal cannot always be reached with the precision we desire). That said, retaining this goal does not preclude the existence of other valuable goals for the discipline—recovery of the original

History (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 136–52; D. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 203–13; Epp, 'Multivalence', 261–4.

[20] One thinks especially of the title of Wescott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. However, they also qualify their goal by noting that they seek the original texts 'so far as they can now be determined from surviving documents' (2.1).

[21] B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), p. xv.

[22] Parker, *The Living Text*, 209.

text need not be the *only* goal. The work of Ehrman (and others) reminds us that textual variants need not be relegated to the status of scraps on the cutting room floor, but can also function as 'windows' into the world of early Christianity, its social history, and the various theological challenges it faced.[23] Such discussion of theologically motivated scribal changes can be traced back to Kirsopp Lake and J. Rendel Harris, and more recently to scholars like Eldon J. Epp and his well-known book, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Cantabrigiensis in Acts*.[24] Recognizing the historical value of such scribal variations need not be set in opposition to the goal of recovering the original text. These two aspects of textual criticism are complementary, not mutually exclusive. Indeed, it is only when we can have some degree of assurance regarding the original text that we are even able to recognize that later scribes occasionally changed it for their own theological purposes. Without the former we would not have the latter.

THE PAPYRI AND THE EARLY TEXT

To many, the fresh discoveries of New Testament papyri, offering something both new and old, hold an inherent attraction. But despite the interest they have generated, the significance of the papyri for textual scholars is still quite debated. Over two decades ago Epp noted that the early papyri 'contribute virtually no new substantial variants' to the collection of variants already known from the later tradition.[25] Even with the discovery of many more papyri the situation has not changed.[26] Thus, it is not uncommon for experts to observe that, in spite of the mounting evidence from the early period, the critical editions of the NT have changed relatively little since the work of

[23] Ehrman, 'The Text as Window', 361–79.

[24] K. Lake, *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament* (Oxford: Parker & Son, 1904); J. R. Harris, 'New Points of View in Textual Criticism', *ExpTim* 7 (1914): 316–34; E. J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge: CUP, 1966).

[25] E. J. Epp, 'The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 101. He continued by saying that this suggests 'not only that virtually all of the New Testament variants are preserved somewhere in our extant manuscript tradition, but also that representatives of virtually all textual complexions have been preserved for us in the papyri'.

[26] Affirmed in 1994 by B. D. Ehrman, 'The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century', in D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, eds., *Codex Bezae* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 100. Affirmed by J. K. Elliott, in full view of the papyri numbered up to $\mathfrak{P}^{116}$, in 'The Nature of the Evidence Available for Reconstructing the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century', in C.-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott, eds., *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), 16.

Westcott and Hort.[27] Since 'earlier is not necessarily better', Keith Elliott has even criticized a tendency on the part of editors to give too much weight to the papyri in their critical editions of the NT.[28]

Yet the non-revolutionary nature of the texts contained in the papyri recovered so far is itself worthy of comment. According to Ehrman, the papyri have had the effect 'of showing that while aspects of our textual theories needed to be modified, the basic physiognomy of our reconstructed originals was altogether on target'.[29] It also means that the fourth-century 'best texts', the 'Alexandrian' codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, have roots extending throughout the entire third century and even into the second. Even so, vigorous debate continues about how to analyze and classify the readings of the papyri and about their potential to deliver an accurate picture of the development of the NT text in the early period.

Classifying Early Papyri Readings: Text Type or Type of Text?

Since the nineteenth century the textual criticism of the New Testament has rested mainly upon the great fourth- and fifth-century uncials, א, A, B, C, D, and W and on the classification of the manuscripts of the textual tradition according to text types. (In the classic formulation of Colwell, a 'text type' could be defined as 'a group of manuscripts that agree more than 70 per cent of the time and is separated by a gap of about 10 per cent from its neighbors'.[30]) At the beginning of the twentieth century only nine papyri were known. Then came a number of exciting discoveries from Oxyrhynchus and the appearance of the Chester Beatty and Martin Bodmer collections. Little by little, the accumulating papyri, some of which contained substantial portions of text, allowed scholars a glimpse of the text of the New Testament writings before the time of the esteemed uncials. In 1957 Jack Suggs made an acute observation about the papyri and posed a question: 'The papyri texts frequently give the appearance of being "mixed" texts. But how can second- and third-century texts be derived by mixture of later texts?'[31] Clearly, they cannot. Either the 'later texts' are actually earlier than imagined, or the effort to classify

[27] B. Aland, 'The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History', in Charles Horton, ed., *The Earliest Gospels*[5] (London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 108; B. Ehrman, 'The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism', in Aland and Delobel, *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History*, 122 n. 15.

[28] Elliott, 'The Nature of the Evidence', 11.

[29] Ehrman, 'Patristic Evidence', 119.

[30] See E. C. Colwell, *Studies in the Methodology of the Text Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 59.

[31] M. J. Suggs, 'The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text', *NTS* 4 (1957–8): 145.

the papyri according to text types which only emerged later is backwards. These two explanations have become fountainheads for two streams of analysis of the papyri which continue up to the present.

In the second edition of his book on textual criticism in 1968 Bruce Metzger included in his descriptive list of the NT papyri an assessment of the text type to which they corresponded. He did not hesitate to characterize some of the early papyri as having the sort of 'mixed' texts which Suggs had questioned. Kurt and Barbara Aland responded specifically to Metzger in their handbook on textual criticism, warning that 'Descriptions in such terms as "mixed text," "partly Alexandrian, partly Western (pre-Caesarean) text," etc., to describe manuscripts of a period when these groups had not yet developed and could hardly be "mixed" contribute nothing to clear thinking.'[32] Even in the 2005 fourth edition of Metzger's *Text*, however, he and Ehrman continue to affirm the existence of two major text types, Western and Alexandrian, in the second century.[33] They continue to speak of $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ as 'intermediate between the Alexandrian and the Western'[34] and of $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ as 'mixed, with elements that are typically Alexandrian and Western'.[35]

Based on Metzger's evaluations, Eldon Epp in 1989 argued that the textual characters of the papryi placed most of them into four constellations which corresponded to the major text types.[36] Well aware that there were those who 'eschew the identification of text-types in the early period', Epp still maintained that three of these types were in existence by around 200 CE or shortly thereafter, and that the $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$-B text clearly existed in the second century. He described an 'A' Group, texts which foreshadow and approximate the Byzantine type and connect to Alexandrinus (A) (in the Gospels); a 'B' Group, texts which foreshadow and approximate the Alexandrian type and connect to Sinaiticus (a) and Vaticanus (B); a 'C' Group, texts which show a mixed type, between the B and D groups, and connect to Washingtoniensis (W); and a 'D' Group, texts which foreshadow and approximate the Western type and connect to Bezae (D). Epp reaffirmed the groupings in 1995[37] and defended them as 'constellations' in a Society of Biblical Literature paper in 2008. We may chart his constellations as in Table I.1.

[32] K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn., tr. E. F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids, 1989; 1981 German original), 59.

[33] Metzger and Ehrman, *Text*, 278.

[34] Ibid. 54.

[35] Ibid. 67.

[36] Epp, 'The Significance of the Papyri'.

[37] E. J. Epp, 'The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament', in B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 17–18, repeated in 2004, with the statement that they were 'highly provisional', in Eldon Jay Epp, *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), ch. 13, esp. 380–1.

Table I.1. Epp's Classification of the Papyri in 1989

Century	'A' Group	'B' Group[a]	'C' Group[b]	'D' Group[c]
2nd		$\mathfrak{P}^{52}$		
2nd/3rd		$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$		
3rd		$\mathfrak{P}^{1}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{15}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{20}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{23}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{28}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{39}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{47}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{65}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{91}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ (most of Mark), $\mathfrak{P}^{27}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{5}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{29}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$?
3rd/4th		$\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{16}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ [in Peter], $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{37}$?	$\mathfrak{P}^{37}$?, $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ [Jude], 0171
4th		$\mathfrak{P}^{10}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{62}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{71}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{86}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{8}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{25}$?	
4th/5th		$\mathfrak{P}^{50}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{57}$		$\mathfrak{P}^{19}$?, $\mathfrak{P}^{21}$?
5th		$\mathfrak{P}^{14}$		
4th/6th		$\mathfrak{P}^{56}$		
6th	$\mathfrak{P}^{84}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{33+58}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{36}$	
6th/7th		$\mathfrak{P}^{3}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{43}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{44}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{55}$		
7th	$\mathfrak{P}^{68}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$?	$\mathfrak{P}^{11}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{31}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{34}$		
7th/8th	$\mathfrak{P}^{42}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{60}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{61}$?		$\mathfrak{P}^{41}$

[a] In 'Papyrus Manuscripts', 17, he added L and 33 and pointed to a connection between P46 and 1739 for Paul.

[b] Ibid. he mentions also f^{13}.

[c] Ibid. he mentions only $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$, 0171, and perhaps $\mathfrak{P}^{29}$, and connects them to D and to 1739 in Acts, 614, and 383.

But while some text critics were comparing manuscripts with each other to find similarities and groups, the Alands at the Münster Institut were comparing manuscripts with their presumed archetypes, and with the 'original' or *Ausgangstext*, the text which first circulated. The Alands have maintained unwaveringly that text types as such did not exist in the second century.[38] What the complexities of the earlier papyri showed instead was the freedom of the text in that period. Even the very close correspondence between $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ (Luke and John) from around 200 and the Gospel text of Vaticanus from the mid-fourth century does not signify a text type, resulting from a deliberate

[38] Aland and Aland, *Text*, 64 (among many other places). It is notable that the Coherence Based Genealogical Method developed by Gerd Mink—which allows scholars to develop genealogical trees of MSS—is not built on the traditional text-type model and is now being used to reconstruct textual flow by the editors of the *Editio critica maior* (G. Mink, 'Ein umfassende Genealogie der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung', *NTS* 39 (1993): 481–99; see discussion in Parker, *New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, 169–71, and note the series *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1987–). As a result, some scholars, like Holger Strutwolf, have begun to suggest that the traditional text-types should be abandoned entirely (Strutwolf's comments were made in a paper delivered at the Nov. 2006 SBL annual meeting in Washington, DC).

recension, but only a line of strictly copied texts executed with great care.[39] Manuscripts which did not conform to this careful or strict line of copying were simply the result of scribal 'freedom'. Thus, what may look like early forms of the 'Western' text anticipating codex D are not the products of a recension but of a certain negligence in copying.[40]

The Münster approach then is to attempt to classify early manuscripts in three major groups 'strict text', 'normal text', and 'free text' (sometimes with further modifications: 'at least normal', 'like D'), according to how closely they mirrored the original or *Ausgangstext*—assumed for practical purposes to be the text now established by over a century of text critical work, the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graeca* (now the 27th edn.).[41] Critics are correct to point to the circularity of this approach.[42] Yet, because the vast majority of textual critics[43] seem to agree that the current editions (NA^{27} and UBS^{4}) reproduce a text which must be close to the original or *Ausgangstext*, using the method as a working hypothesis[44] seems unobjectionable to many, at least as a point of departure.

Text Quality: The Early Text as 'Free Text'?

Throughout much of the twentieth century it appeared that the text of the early period exhibited a much greater 'freedom' than in the later period, when

39 See also G. Fee, 'The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria', in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 272; originally publ. in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney, *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974). Echoing Hort's judgments of a century earlier, Fee claimed that $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ and B 'seem to represent a "relatively pure" form of preservation of a "relatively pure" line of descent from the original text' (272).

40 Cf. B. Aland, 'Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papryi, demonstriert am Johannesevangelium', in W. Weren and D.-A. Koch, eds., *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism* (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003), 37.

41 Aland and Aland, *Text*, 93–5; cf. K. Aland, 'Der neue "Standard-Text" in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln', in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism* (Oxford: OUP, 1981), 257–75; J. H. Petzer, 'The History of the New Testament Text: Its Reconstruction, Significance and Use in New Testament Textual Criticism', in Aland and Delobel, *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History*, 32; B. Aland, 'Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments', in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 1–13.

42 B. D. Ehrman, 'A Problem of Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts', *Biblica,* 70 (1989): 381; Epp, 'Papyrus', 15; B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 3rd edn. (Oxford: OUP, 1993), 290 n.1. The evaluation of William L. Petersen is less charitable: 'A more unscientific, hubris-filled, and self-serving approach to scholarship is hard to imagine' (W. L. Petersen, 'The Genesis of the Gospels', in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 60 n. 89).

43 Notwithstanding what he would later say in *Misquoting Jesus*, 58, Ehrman wrote already in 1994, 'Our surviving evidence can take us back . . . to the point of being reasonably certain that we have before us a close approximation of the original text' ('Patristic Evidence', 122 n. 15).

44 This is what Barbara Aland has maintained that it is (e.g. B. Aland, 'Die Rezeption des neutestamentlichen Textes in den ersten Jahrhunderten', in J.-M. Sevrin, ed., *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 26–7 and elsewhere).

it achieved stability through the sanction of canonicity and greater scribal skill. Even very recent treatments are wont to characterize the early period of copying as 'free', 'wild', 'in a state of flux', 'chaotic', 'a turbid textual morass', or the like, nearly always citing Kurt and Barbara Aland's handbook on NT textual criticism as a prime source for their judgments. The Alands indeed wrote of the text of the NT developing freely before the beginning of the fourth century and spoke of it as a 'living text'. On the other hand, the Alands themselves documented evidence which they believed signified a radical change in this conventional description of the evidence.

> We have inherited from the past generation the view that the early text was a 'free' text, and the discovery of the Chester Beatty papyri seemed to confirm this view. When $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ were joined by $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ sharing the same characteristics, this position seemed to be definitely established. $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ appeared in contrast to be a loner with its "strict' text anticipating Codex Vaticanus. Meanwhile the other witnesses of the early period had been ignored. It is their collations which have changed the picture so completely.[45]

In May of 1988 the Alands finished revisions for the second edition of their handbook.[46] A check of their evaluations reveals that thirty of the forty-four earliest manuscripts (forty papyri and four early parchment uncials) possessed a text which they deemed was 'Normal', 'at least Normal', or 'Strict', and fourteen manuscripts had a text which was 'Free' or 'Like D'.[47] This meant that in 1988 the number of 'free' texts from the early period was outnumbered by good or excellent texts by over two to one.[48] In subsequent work, Barbara Aland has continued the comparison of newly published papyri.[49] In a 2002 article she examined fifteen recently published papyri from Oxyrhynchus[50] and concluded that two of them ($\mathfrak{P}^{110}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{112}$) were 'free' texts, two ($\mathfrak{P}^{101}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{107}$) were 'normal', and the remaining eleven papyri ($\mathfrak{P}^{77}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{102}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{103}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{105}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{106}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{108}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{109}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{113}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{114}$) were copied strictly.[51] If we take out of the equation the three papyri which are from the fourth century or later ($\mathfrak{P}^{105,\ 110,\ 112}$), we may chart the early papyri (available in 2002) as in Table I.2.

[45] Aland and Aland, *Text*, 93–5.

[46] Ibid., p. vi.

[47] Ibid. 93–5; cf. K. Aland, 'Der neue "Standard-Text" in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln', 257–75, and B. Aland, 'Rezeption', 27.

[48] In the last edn. of their handbook, the Alands listed three early papyri to which they attached no rating ($\mathfrak{P}^{90}$ [2nd cent.], $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$ [3rd/4th cent.], $\mathfrak{P}^{95}$ [3rd cent.]), perhaps because they were too recently discovered.

[49] B. Aland, 'Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papyri', 19–38. She characterizes $\mathfrak{P}^{90}$ as clearly based on the initial text (pp. 23–4, 37), which seems to justify labelling it 'normal'. She characterizes $\mathfrak{P}^{95}$ as being like $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ (p. 37), justifying the label 'free'.

[50] B. Aland, 'Kriterien', 1–13.

[51] Ibid. 12.

Table I.2. The Alands' Classification of Papyri as of 2002

Strict	At Least Normal	Normal	Free	Like D
$\mathfrak{P}^{1}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{23}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{27}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{39}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64/67}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{65}$(?), $\mathfrak{P}^{70}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{77}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{102}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{103}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{106}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{108}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{109}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{15}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{22}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{30}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{4}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{5}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{12}$(?), $\mathfrak{P}^{16}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{18}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{20}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{28}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{47}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{52}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ (1, 2 Pet.), $\mathfrak{P}^{87}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{90}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{101}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{107}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{9}$(?), $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$(?), $\mathfrak{P}^{29}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$(Jude), $\mathfrak{P}^{78}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{95}$	$\mathfrak{P}^{38}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$
Early Uncials				
0220	0162, 0189		0171	

Thus, if one accepts the Aland's analyses, in 2002, forty out of fifty-five (or just under 73 percent) of the earliest NT manuscripts had Normal to Strict texts, and fifteen (or just over 27 percent) had Free to Like D texts. The single largest category, consisting of eighteen out of fifty-five (or nearly a third) of the earliest manuscripts, is the category of Strict text. What was previously, even by the Alands, dubbed the 'living text' of the early period now seems to have been 'dead' for nearly three-quarters of the scribes who copied it. Manuscripts of the Gospels fare proportionally even better. Of the twenty-nine earliest Gospel manuscripts, thirteen are listed as Strict, three At Least Normal, seven Normal, and six Free, meaning that the 'freedom' which has been held to be the nearly universal denominator of the early NT textual tradition actually characterizes just over 20 percent of the early Gospel manuscripts.

Many may also wish to ask what a 'free text' actually looks like. In a recent essay, Barbara Aland describes $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, a widely acknowledged free text: 'Superfluous elements and repetitious words are dropped, parallels are restored, conjunctions are inserted and intended meanings are clarified', producing 'such half-conscious changes as transcribers of documents make in seeing that exemplars are reproduced accurately, but also clearly and intelligibly'.[52] She concludes that $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$

> represents the kind of manuscript one might expect from an experienced transcriber of documents. On the whole a reliable copy has been produced. The conspicuous omissions and transpositions are not the work of a scholar carefully comparing exemplars, nor are they the result of intervention by a stylistic editor polishing the text. They are due rather to the standards of regularity and clarity imposed on scribes by their profession. Especially in $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ there is a broad correlation between the professional standards and skill of the scribe and the product of his work.[53]

52 B. Aland, 'The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri', 113.
53 Ibid. 112–13.

From her words, one could judge that in this case the employment of 'professional standards' of copying actually left the NT text in worse shape than it had been before.

As mentioned above, the Alands' method is presented by them as a working hypothesis, and not all NT textual critics regard it as entirely justified.[54] In any case, however, it would seem highly problematic to continue to cite the Alands for the characterization of the textual tradition of the early period as 'free', or something worse.

It is possible, on the other hand, still to maintain that the earliest period of transmission of NT manuscripts was free and quite unstable without invoking the work of the Alands, or indeed the work of any textual critics, in fact, without meaningful reference to the earliest extant manuscripts at all. Such a position was pioneered by Helmut Koester, who at a conference in 1988 chided NT textual critics for being 'surprisingly naïve' and even 'deluded' for not realizing that the first century or so of the life of any ancient text is always the most fluid period of its copying.[55] Since our earliest NT manuscripts (except 𝔓^{52}, whose text is said to be too short to matter) are 100 to 150 years later than their originals, Koester believes we must virtually dismiss the entire body of early manuscripts as evidence for the period which preceded them. 'There can be no question,' he states, 'that special care was given to the text of these writings only after their canonization',[56] an event which Koester places after the end of the second century. Our surviving manuscripts are all, in this interpretation, supposed to be the result of a deliberate recension, a 'fixing' of the text, which occurred around the year 200 in Alexandria. (Petersen has since revised the date down to around 180.[57]) This approach maintains that the only remaining, positive evidence for the second-century text[58] is to be found in the quotations of these writings made by early patristic and apocryphal authors. These quotations are said to prove that second-century writers had available to them only a very free, unstable, or 'chaotic' text.

It is clear in any event that this approach to the early textual tradition operates from a number of assumptions. It assumes, for instance, that a book regarded as 'canonical' would be less prone to scribal alteration than one not

[54] Cf. J. K. Elliott's contribution in Chapter 11 of this volume.

[55] Koester, 'Text of the Synoptic Gospels', 19, 37. He had enunciated this view already in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, ii. *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (New York and Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982; a tr. of his 1980 *Einführung in das Neue Testament*), 20.

[56] Koester, *History and Literature*, 20.

[57] Petersen, 'Genesis of the Gospels', 33–5.

[58] One more support for this position is taken from the allegedly cavalier way in which Matthew and Luke appropriated and changed the words of Mark's Gospel, a pattern of treatment which is then projected onto the 1st- and 2nd-cent. copying of Gospel texts. On these and other issues raised by Koester see Wisse, 'Redactional Changes', 39–53; Parker, *The Living Text*, 106–11; Delobel, 'Achilles' Heel', 3–21.

so regarded. This assumption had been challenged much earlier by Colwell, who argued that in fact the reverse was the case (at least in the case of intentional alteration).[59] Similarly debatable is the assumption that the text of no NT writings could have been regarded as worthy of special care in preservation before the end of the second century, coincidentally, the time when our manuscript tradition begins to be extant in physical form. Yet this disregards a good deal of explicit literary evidence, as Michael Kruger demonstrates in Chapter 4 below. Finally, this approach also depends quite heavily on the supposition that the practice of quoting NT books by early writers was intended to provide essentially exact and trustworthy reproductions of the underlying texts (more trustworthy in fact than actual manuscript copies of those books). In order better to understand and assess early Christian quotation practice, Charles Hill examines the practice of literary borrowing in non-Christian writers of the period in Chapter 14 below.

Meanwhile, more recent developments have arguably brought the picture of the second-century text of the NT a bit better into focus. First, even in 1988 Koester's assessment of the number of second-century NT manuscripts then extant may have been 'rather too gloomy',[60] but since then four more have come to light which some experts date to that century: $\mathfrak{P}^{98}$ (Rev.), $\mathfrak{P}^{103}$ (Matt.), $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$ (Matt.), $\mathfrak{P}^{109}$ (John). With the discovery of more early manuscripts, a clear majority of which preserve a text recognizably conforming to the reconstructed initial text, the issue of the continuity of the textual tradition becomes more acute. Can this conformity be explained by the theory that all of these texts are the product of a newly minted recension, introduced to the churches as late as 180–200? Or does it imply that it is preceded by a longer tradition?

Second, some experts now think the early papyri themselves can tell us something about the manuscripts that preceded them, as we shall now see.

Transmission Quality

By examining features of the text which appear to be due to the individual scribe's work, Barbara Aland concludes that '$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ represents a rough and inadequate copy of a good exemplar'.[61] James Royse, in his truly massive study of Christian scribal habits, has exhibited what may be learned about individual scribal habits from the analysis of singular readings (readings which

[59] E. C. Colwell, *What is the Best New Testament?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), 52–3.

[60] Elliott, 'The Nature of the Evidence', 11.

[61] B. Aland, 'Significance', 112–13.

are unique to a single manuscript in the textual tradition), particularly when relatively large texts provide us with extended portions of a scribe's work.[62] While absolute determinations about which changes came from the individual scribe and which ones the scribe inherited may be impossible, some believe they can distinguish at least some of the textual phenomena attributable to the scribe of an individual manuscript. This, in turn, allows a glimpse of an even earlier text.

For example, accepting Aland's analysis of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ above would mean that the exemplar used by the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ held a text which was closer to the NA^{27} text of Paul (and Hebrews) than was the text this scribe produced at around the year 200. In turn, this would mean that the textual tradition inherited by this scribe was characterized by less rather than by greater freedom from the NA^{27} text.

What keeps this method from being simply circular (i.e. removing what does not conform to the *assumed* original text will restore an earlier and more original text) is that the features at issue do not include all forms of variation but only obvious scribal errors. Particularly relevant would be those errors which result from the scribe skipping from one or more letters to other like letters (haplography and dittography), and phenomena which appear to manifest the habitual traits of an individual scribe. Identifying such obvious scribal contributions—whether they in fact came from the scribe of the individual document or from a predecessor—may enable a somewhat clearer estimate of the underlying text which the scribe had inherited.

In his recent dissertation on the Matthew papyri conducted under Barbara Aland's direction, Kyoung Shik Min develops a separate category called 'Transmission Quality' to allow him to sort out what appear to be errors attributable to the individual scribe.[63] Among his judgments are: that the scribe who produced $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$ produced a 'free' text, but that the scribe's exemplar contained a 'normal' text; that the work of the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$ was 'free' while the text in his exemplar was 'strict'.[64] In Chapter 5 below, Tommy Wasserman interacts critically with Min's judgments and offers his own fresh evaluations of the scribal evidence.

The results of this kind of analysis, if valid, will be highly relevant to any inquiry about the transmission of the text in the second century. Accepting

[62] Royse, *Scribal Habits*.

[63] Kyoung Shik Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005).

[64] Only if there was correction against a better exemplar would we have good reason to expect a scribe to *improve* the text towards an earlier form. $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ (John), where numerous corrections are present, shows us that this was sometimes done in the early period. James Royse's chapter below suggests that the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ may have been using such a corrected exemplar. Where such comparison was not made with a second, better exemplar the expectation would of course be that each generation of copying represents a degree of departure from its previous tradition.

Min's and Wasserman's conclusions would mean that the 'freedom' thought to characterize certain manuscripts could, in some cases, pertain to the scribe alone and not to the preceding scribal tradition. Wasserman concludes that the text of Matthew's Gospel which reached these third-century scribes, instead of being freer and more chaotic, came to them in a form which looked even more like Matthew in NA^{27}.

Public and Private Copies

Another promising line of enquiry for understanding the second-century textual transmission process has emerged not from the text preserved in the papyri, but from the study of the papyri as physical specimens, as scribal artifacts. By examining *non-textual* features, scholars have been able to make tentative or solid deductions about the uses for which books were intended. On the basis of the codex form and the *nomina sacra* techniques, which occur in all of our NT manuscripts, and the possible presence of scriptoria, Epp already in 1989 wrote, 'These standardization procedures permit us to claim that our very earliest New Testament papyri had antecedents or ancestors as much as a century earlier than their own time.'[65] That is, such features imply at least some level of control, rather than complete scribal autonomy, in the copying and transmission of the manuscripts. In more recent years scholars have looked further into the physical features of the manuscripts and now speak of two broad categories of usage they depict: public use (reading in corporate worship) and private use (reading by individuals).[66] Scott Charlesworth in Chapter 2 and Larry Hurtado in Chapter 3 below explore, respectively, what these formatting features might imply about the scribal culture which produced them and about the specific reading-culture for which they were intended.

While absolute determinations are not possible, the following traits are at least suggestive that a document is designed for public use:

Reading aids

Documents intended to be read aloud would tend to contain more lectional aids designed to help the reader navigate the *scriptio continua* with proficiency in a public setting.[67] As Colin Roberts has observed, such reading aids are

[65] Epp, 'Significance', 101–2.

[66] S. D. Charlesworth, 'Public and Private: Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts', in C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias, eds., *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 148–75.

[67] For the lack of such lectional aids in Greek literary texts, see E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 7–12.

noteworthy because 'As a rule Greek manuscripts make very few concessions to the reader.'[68] Examples of these reading aids include: sense breaks,[69] diaeresis,[70] rough breathing marks,[71] punctuation points,[72] and accents.[73] All of these features would help divide up the text in a manner that would be particularly suitable for public reading.

Lines per page

Critical to making reading an easier task was the spacing of the lines, which in turn affected both the size and spacing of individual letters. Turner notes that while classical literary texts can have upwards of fifty lines per page, some Christian texts of the same size average far fewer lines (and letters per line).[74] A noteworthy example of this trend is $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ which is estimated to have about twenty-five–twenty-eight lines per page (at least in the earliest portions), whereas P.Oxy. 2537 (Lysias) is approximately the same size and averages forty-five or more lines per page.[75] Such spacing suggests that these manuscripts were designed 'to ease the task of [public] reading aloud'.[76]

Scribal hand

It is well known that most early Christian papyri (second and third centuries) were not characterized by the formal bookhand that was common among Jewish scriptural books or Greco-Roman literary texts, but were often marked

[68] C. H. Roberts, 'Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester', *BJRL* 20 (1936): 227.

[69] Examples of such spacing in Christian MSS include P.Egerton 2 (2nd cent.); $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ (2nd/3rd cent.); P.Dura inv. 24 (3rd cent.); $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ (3rd cent.); $\mathfrak{P}^{100}$ (3rd/4th cent.); $\mathfrak{P}^{115}$ (3rd/4th cent.); P. Oxy. 1080 (4th cent.); the Chester Beatty Melito (4th cent.); Codex Sinaiticus (4th cent.); and Codex Alexandrinus (5th cent.). E. J. Revell, 'The Oldest Evidence for the Hebrew Accent System', *BJRL* 54 (1971): 214–22, esp. 214–15, notes that a number of Hebrew texts from Qumran exhibit such spacing in order to mark various divisions in the text. See also E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 210–11, 299–315, who argues spacing was used in both Hebrew and Greek Old Testament texts.

[70] Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, 10.

[71] Breathings are found occasionally in the oldest Christian MSS, and when they do appear they are normally a rough breathing. Examples include $\mathfrak{P}^{5}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{113}$, P.Oxy. 1779, the Chester Beatty Genesis, and the recently discovered $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$ (P.Oxy. 4404), dated to the late 2nd cent.

[72] Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 8–12.

[73] Accents were relatively rare in early Christian writings, but they do appear on occasion; P.Mich. 130 (3rd cent.) and P.Ryl. 1.1 (3rd/4th cent.) contain a surprising number of accents and other lectional aids. See C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: OUP, 1979), 10.

[74] E. G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 85–7.

[75] Hurtado, *Artifacts*, 173–4.

[76] Turner, *Typology*, 85.

by a more plain hand that could be called 'informal uncial' or even 'reformed documentary'.[77] However, despite the fact that this style did not share the elegance and artistry of the typical literary script, it was not normally as rough and rapidly written as most documentary papyri. Lest one construe the early stages of Christian handwriting as unprofessional, Roberts points out that 'a degree of regularity and clarity is aimed at and achieved'.[78] And, while early Christian papyri certainly exhibit a mix of literary and documentary features, Haines-Eitzen acknowledges that early Christian papyri 'appear toward the literary end of the spectrum'.[79] Although the presence of a literary or semi-literary scribal hand does not guarantee a document is designed for public use, a substantial lack of quality in the scribal hand strongly suggests a document has been written for private use (and likely within the context of an informal and uncontrolled scribal environment).[80] For instance, 𝔓^{37} (P.Mich. 3.137), a fragmentary codex of Matthew, has a scribal hand that is near the documentary end of the scale, suggesting it was produced as a private manuscript (it also lacks the other readers aids that are typical of manuscripts designed for public use).[81]

This distinction between public and private copies offers a very credible, partial explanation for why some NT manuscripts appear to have been copied with greater freedom than others. Charlesworth argues that manuscripts designed for public use, like 𝔓^{75},[82] were likely created in more controlled Christian copy 'centers' associated with larger Christian congregations and were likely based on the master copies that were normally used by those congregation in public worship.[83] On the other hand, copies made for private

77 Roberts, *Manuscript*, 14. Some *literary* papyri of classical works were also written in a rather plain, unadorned, and non-calligraphic hand (e.g. P.Oxy. 1809, 2076, 2288). However, E. G. Turner does not necessarily consider this as an indication of low scribal quality; indeed, he declares that '"calligraphic" hands are suspect . . . It is not uncommon for the finest looking hands to be marred by gross carelessness in transcription': 'Scribes and Scholars', in A. K. Bowman *et al.* (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007), 258–9.

78 Roberts, *Manuscript*, 14.

79 Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 65. The general distinction between 'literary' and 'documentary' papyri has come under criticism as some scholars have challenged the sharp dichotomy often drawn between the two. See Turner, *Greek Papyri*, pp. vi–vii; R. A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, 2nd edn. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967), 1; and E. J. Epp, 'New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts and Letter Carrying in Greco-Roman Times', in B. A. Pearson *et al.*, eds., *The Future of Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 39–40.

80 Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 168.

81 E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 88–96; Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 161.

82 Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 159–61. The scribal hand of 𝔓^{75} is of high quality, the letters are written larger than normal size, and it contains a number of lectional aides (diaeresis, rough breathings, and punctuation points). For more on this fragment, see V. Martin and R. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV* (Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961); and C. L. Porter, 'Papyrus Bodmer XV (p75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus', *JBL* 81 (1962): 363–76.

83 Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 171–2; and see Chapter 2 in this volume.

use were normally not subject to the same level of care and control. Harry Gamble in Chapter 1 below documents evidence that such copy 'centers' existed in the second century in major Christian locales such as Rome, Smyrna, and Alexandria.[84] And the abundance of evidence from the provincial city of Oxyrhynchus[85] suggests that churches in cities such as Antioch, Caesarea, Jerusalem, and elsewhere, must also have had efficient means for the reproduction and distribution of Christian texts.

Thus, the investigation of the quality of the work accomplished by the scribes, and the study of non-textual, scribal conventions which imply an earlier tradition of controlled copying, are two promising avenues not only for understanding the manuscripts we now have, but also possibly casting light on the earlier period from which no manuscripts survive.

In concluding this essay, we emphasize that textual critics today—including the contributors to the present volume—hold differing views about the kinds of analyses we have been discussing. For this reason the editors have not asked the individual authors, all of whom are experts in their own rights, to endorse one approach or method over another. We have asked contributors in Part II, which analyzes the fund of early NT manuscripts, however, at least to note the Alands' judgments about the strictness or freedom of each text in the tables they provide, for these judgments constitute one significant datum which many researchers use in formulating judgments about the transmission of the NT text in the early period. In addition, all these contributors have been asked to offer their own professional judgments on the characteristics and quality of transmission of the text of the books in their purview.

OUTLINE OF THE PRESENT VOLUME

Part I. The Textual and Scribal Culture of Early Christianity

As we have just seen, understanding the world and the work of the scribe has become increasingly important for attaining an accurate assessment of the way

[84] Also, Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 155–9; Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 157.

[85] Oxyrhynchus has also provided numerous non-biblical Christian writings from this time period. See E. J. Epp, 'The New Testament Papyri at Oxyrhynchus in their Social and Intellectual Context', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 47–68; P. M. Head, 'Some Recently Published NT Papyri from Oxyrhynchus: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment', *TynBul* 51 (2000), 1–16. For more on the site of Oxyrhynchus as a whole see A. Luijendijk, *Greetings in the Lord* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008); P. J. Parsons *et al.*, eds., *Oxyrhynchus* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007). For a detailed catalogue of Oxyrhynchus papyri see J. Krüger, *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1990).

the text of the NT writings was transmitted in the second century. The chapters in this section offer new studies of several aspects of scribal culture which relate to the earliest period of copying, including background information on the Roman book trade (Gamble), the implications of certain scribal features found in early NT manuscripts (Charlesworth and Hurtado), and the attitudes Christians took towards the scribal process (Kruger).

Part II. The Manuscript Tradition

In this section contributors offer detailed and up-to-date assessments of the early textual tradition of the NT manuscripts. Scholars often must generalize about the history of the transmission of the NT, and yet each individual book or group of books—like the Gospels (Wasserman, Head, Hernández, and Chapa), Acts (Tuckett), the Pauline corpus (Royse), the Catholic letters (Elliott), and Revelation (Nicklas)—has a particular history which may distinguish it in some ways from the others. Thus, each book or sub-corpus is here treated in a separate chapter which surveys the available textual materials from the early period and offers a fresh analysis. In addition, one chapter is devoted to the witness of the earliest versions (Williams).

Part III. Early Citation and Use of the New Testament Writings

Besides the witness of the Greek and versional manuscripts of the earliest period, a vital source for our knowledge of the early texts exists in quotations and other borrowings of NT writings by early Christian writers. The final section of the book devotes a chapter to citation practices and standards in the second century (Hill), and then provides chapters on the NT materials found in the Apostolic Fathers (Foster), the Gospel and Pauline texts known to Marcion (Roth), the Gospel texts known to Justin Martyr (Verheyden), the form of the Greek Gospels used by Tatian for his *Diatessaron* (Baarda), the traces of NT writings present in early apocryphal literature (Porter), and finally, on the Gospel texts used by Irenaeus of Lyons (Bingham and Todd) and Clement of Alexandria (Cosaert) near the end of the second century.

This page intentionally left blank

I

The Textual and Scribal Culture of Early Christianity

This page intentionally left blank

1

The Book Trade in the Roman Empire

Harry Y. Gamble

The phrase 'book trade' refers to the publication and dissemination of books—by whatever means. Today the phrase commonly refers to agencies and methods involved in the *commercial* production and distribution of books. The modern commercial book trade, which is an enormous enterprise, is a function of the technology of book production, of capitalist economies and of a mass literacy that provides a large and ready market for books. In the ancient world, which had a different technology of book production, a different sort of economy, and mass *il*literacy, the publication and dissemination of books necessarily took different forms. There was, to be sure, a commercial book trade in antiquity, but there were also channels and means for the production and circulation of texts that operated independently of commercial interests and were actuated by other motives. Hence we must reckon with multiple ways in which books were published and gained circulation in the Roman world.[1] Only against such a background can we consider how early Christian texts were produced, distributed, and subsequently transmitted.

[1] General discussions of the book trade in antiquity may be found in Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhaltniss zur Litteratur* (Berlin: Hertz, 1882), W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Romern*, 3rd edn. (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1962), F. Reichmann, 'The Book Trade at the Time of the Roman Empire', *Library Quarterly,* 8 (1938): 40–76, H. L. Pinner, *The World of Books in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden: Sijthhoff, 1948), 22–49, T. Kleberg, *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), J. J. Phillips, 'The Publication of Books at Rome in the Classical Period' (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981), R. Fehrle, *Das Bibliothekswesen im Alten Rom* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1986), 29–53, and H. Blanck, *Das Buch in der Antike* (Munich: Beck, 1992). The best concise discussion is R. Starr, 'The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World', *CQ* 37 (1987): 219–23.

THE COMMERCIAL BOOK TRADE IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

By the Roman imperial period the commercial book trade already had a long history behind it, but the course of its development and the modes of its operation are difficult to reconstruct owing to the fragmentary and incidental nature of the evidence. We first hear of a book trade in Rome or in the West generally in the late Republican period, when Cicero refers to a bookshop (*taberna libraria*, *Phil.* 2.21) and Catullus mentions the presence of works of fellow poets on the 'shelves of book-dealers' (*librariorum scrinia*, *carm.* 14.17–20), but the preponderance of the evidence for commerce in books belongs to the late first and second centuries CE.

Booksellers, variously called *librarii* or *bibliopolae*, are occasionally mentioned and some are known by name. Horace says that the Socii brothers produced and sold his books (*Ep.* 1.20.2; *Ars poet.* 345); a certain Tryphon was a commercial agent for Quintilian (*Inst. orat.*, ep. praem.) as well as for Martial (4.72.2; 13.3.4), whose poems were also available through Atrectus (1.117.13–17), Secundus (1.2.7–8), and Pollio Valerianus (1.113.5), while Seneca notes that books of Cicero and Livy were sold by a certain Dorus (*Ben.* 7.6). These dealers in books were located in Rome, which was undoubtedly the center of the commercial book trade in the West, and their shops seem to have been clustered near the center of the city not far from the Forum.[2] Like other small-business persons, book dealers were enterprising freedmen; as such they lacked liberal education and social distinction and so had no natural ties with the literary elite.[3]

We are not well-informed about the operations of the commercial book trade but can make some reasonable inferences. The term *librarius* could signify either a professional copyist or a book dealer, and no doubt these were originally the same: trained scribes, recognizing a financial opportunity, began making copies to sell to the public. Only later was the term *bibliopola* borrowed from Greek and used to designate a dealer as distinct from a copyist, although *librarius* continued to be the ordinary term for a bookseller. If trade proved profitable, an enterprising copyist or a merchandising entrepreneur would have distinguished the tasks of production and marketing and hired others. Book dealers were never merely retailers but also manufacturers:

[2] On the location of these shops and its implications, see esp. P. White, 'Bookshops in the Literary Culture of Rome', in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker, eds., *Ancient Literacies* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 268–87, who notes that the proximity of bookshops to each other suggests that 'books had a distinct commercial identity' and were sold separately from other commodities.

[3] N. Brockmeyer, 'Die soziale Stellung der "Buchhandler" in der Antike', *AGBL* 13 (1973): 238–48. The preponderance of Greek names is noteworthy, and is one indication that the development of the Roman book trade owed something to growing Roman interest in Greek literature.

absent suppliers, every book they sold had to be individually copied out in-house.

Nothing suggests that retail manufacture and trade in books was profitable enough to lead to extensive development. The bookshops mentioned by Pliny, Martial, Quintilian, Aulus Gellius, and others were small operations in modest premises, and there is no reason to think that copies of texts were produced in large numbers either by an individual dealer or by the trade as a whole. Since capital would not have been routinely risked in anticipation of strong demand, the standard practice was probably to produce single copies commissioned by individual customers.[4] Booksellers were also inhibited by the absence of copyright protections, for any book they produced and sold could itself be copied by anyone who had access to it. In addition, the market for books was limited; prospective buyers were only a fraction of the small minority of literate people, and of them, only those with enough disposable income to buy luxury items.

Arrangements between authors, copyists, and book dealers also have to be conjectured. As a rule, ancient authors were not dependent on the commercial book trade, but some authors were more closely connected with it than others. Horace, Pliny, Martial, and Quintilian put at least some of their works with dealers.[5] An author may have received a flat fee, in return for which the dealer gained the right to make and sell copies. But when ancient authors speak of profits they customarily assume that these will accrue to the dealer, not to them; what an author anticipated was literary notoriety.[6] Financial benefit to the author came rather from literary patrons, and patronage had nothing to do with commerce in books.[7] Even so, authors who stood outside the literary establishment or enjoyed no strong patronage may have seen other advantages in placing their work with a bookseller: it might come more promptly to the

[4] Starr, 'Circulation', 220. Th. Birt (*Das antike Buchwesen*, 351–3), appealing to Pliny's *Ep.* 4.7), supposed that an ordinary 'run' of copies was between 500 and 1,000. Against such a notion see Kenneth Quinn, 'The Poet and his Audience in the Augustan Age', *ANRW* II.30.1(1982), 75–180 at 78–83, and J. Iddeng, '*Publica aut peri!*', *SO* 81 (2006): 75–6. The idea that there were 'mass-production scriptoria' of 'big publishers' in the ancient world (thus T. C. Skeat, 'The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book-Production', *PBA* 42 (1956): 189) is completely anachronistic.

[5] The claim of A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), 91, re *Ep.* 1.2, that 'the distribution of [Pliny's] books was entirely in the hands of the bibliopolae', seems unwarranted: Pliny seldom mentions the book trade. Such a claim might better be made for Martial, who mentions book dealers and their shops more than any ancient writer and encourages his readers to patronize them.

[6] Cf. e.g. Horace, *Ars poet.* 345; Martial 3.38; 11.3; 13.3; 1.117.

[7] On patronage in the Roman Empire see R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge; CUP, 1982), A. Wallace-Hadrill, ed., *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London: Routledge, 1989) and B. K. Gold, ed., *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, 1982). On literary patronage see also P. White, '*Amicitia* and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome', *JRS* 68 (1978): 74–92; R. P. Saller, 'Martial on Patronage and Literature', *CQ* 33 (1983): 246–57; K. Quinn, 'The Poet and his Audience in the Augustan Age', 116–39.

notice of the general public; an accurate text might be better insured if at the outset copies were made directly from an authorial exemplar; and inquiries and requests could be referred to a dealer.

The growth of the commercial book trade was stimulated by various factors. One of these was the creation of libraries, both institutional and private.[8] The establishment in the Hellenistic period of the great libraries at Alexandria and Pergamum, not to mention the smaller libraries created in provincial cities and towns in association with temples and gymnasia, fueled a market in books and gave incentive to those who could provide them. In the Roman imperial period these Greek precedents were eagerly imitated. The library constructed beside the Forum in 39 BCE by Asinius Pollio was the first of many state libraries in Rome. Others were built by Augustus, Tiberius, Vespasian, Trajan, and Alexander Severus, and by the early fourth century there were no fewer than twenty-eight such libraries in the city.[9] Libraries were also established in the provinces through the largess of individual benefactors.[10] Moreover, beginning in the Republican period and continuing into the empire, persons of literary and intellectual interests accumulated substantial private libraries.[11] Indeed, the personal library came to be seen as a feature of social distinction, and aspirants to elite status acquired private libraries in pretense of an education and literary cultivation that were often lacking.[12] Although there were other means by which books could be acquired, the commercial book

[8] State and civic libraries were not 'public' in any modern sense. See T. K. Dix, ' "Public Libraries" in Ancient Rome: Ideology and Reality', *Libraries and Culture,* 29 (1994): 282–96.

[9] On ancient libraries generally, see C. Callmer, 'Antike Bibliotheken', *Opuscula Archaeologica,* 3 (1944): 145–93; C. Wendel, 'Bibliothek', *RAC* 2 (1954): 246–74; K. Dziatzko, 'Bibliotheken', *RE* 3 (1944): 405–24; Blanck, *Das Buch*, 133–222; and (more popularly) L. Casson, *Libraries in the Ancient World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001). A valuable overview for Rome is given by T. K. Dix and G. W. Houston, 'Public Libraries in the City of Rome: From the Augustan Age to the Time of Diocletian', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Antiquité,* 118 (2006): 671–717.

[10] Libraries were founded in their native cities by, among others, Pliny in Como, Dio Chrysostom at Prusa, Julius Aquila at Ephesus, and Pantaenus at Athens.

[11] Beyond imperial residences, private libraries were doubtless numerous among the literary households of the aristocracy. See T. K. Dix, 'Private and Public Libraries at Rome in the First Century' (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1986); L. Bruce, 'Palace and Villa Libraries from Augustus to Hadrian', *Journal of Library History,* 21 (1986): 510–52; T. Kleberg, 'Bucherliebhaberei und private Buchersammlungen in der romischen Kaiserzeit', in J. Mayerhofer and W. Ritzer, eds., *Festschrift J. Stummvoll* (Vienna: Hollinek, 1970), 401–9, and Blanck, *Das Buch*, 152–60. Some book lists preserved on papyri appear to be inventories of personal libraries. See R. Otronto, *Antiche liste di libri su papiro* (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2000), and G. W. Houston, 'Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries in the Roman Empire', in *Ancient Literacies*, 233–67.

[12] Lucian (*adv. Ind*), Seneca (*Dial.* 9.9.4–7), Juvenal (*Sat.* 2.4–7), and Petronius (*Sat.* 48) satirize those who acquire books for show, without appreciating their contents. On Lucian's elaborate parody see now the discussion of W. A. Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire* (Oxford: OUP, 2010), 157–78.

trade provided one source to which collectors might turn.[13] All together, these various sorts of libraries created a demand to which the commercial book trade responded.[14] In addition, there was under the empire an enlargement and diversification of a reading public as a result of increasing social differentiation and opportunity for upward mobility. Beyond the small aristocratic circles where the leisured enjoyment of books was traditional, there were the ranks of professional rhetoricians, grammarians, and philosophers, and still others of the lower social orders who, while not well-educated, were literate to a degree and had some interest, if not in *belles-lettres*, then in lesser forms of literature. Even with this expansion, the reading public remained only a small minority, but one sufficient to sustain commerce in books.

Authors who refer to bookshops often do so disparagingly. In part this is merely a reflex of class prejudice, for the aristocracy generally disdained commerce of any sort. But substantive criticisms of booksellers indicate that their products sometimes contained defective texts (either incorrectly written or inadequately corrected), that their advertisements were misleading, or that they capitalized on pirated, misattributed, or forged materials.[15] For all such reasons the cultured reader might have steered clear of retail bookshops and preferred other sources.

Older studies posited a close relation between authors and book dealers, assuming that literary work entered the public domain exclusively or mainly through the retail trade, and that dealers were the effective 'publishers' of ancient books. While recent studies have rightly discounted this anachronistic appraisal, the role of the commercial book trade in the production and circulation of texts should not be unduly minimized.[16] Booksellers would have found their best opportunities in a reading public that lay outside the small and insular circles of cultivated aristocrats and scholars, and in provincial areas where books were less easily to be found.[17] Moreover, bookshops and book dealers had a practical bibliographical knowledge about the locations, availability, and forms of books, and such information had some value even for cultivated readers.[18]

[13] A telling instance is Cicero's effort to assist his brother Quintus in acquiring books for his library (*ad Quint. Frat.* 3.4.5): Cicero assumes that at least some will have to be bought at retail.

[14] It is not insignificant that, as White ('Bookshops', 271–6) points out, the bookshops of Rome seem to have been concentrated in proximity to the large institutional libraries.

[15] e.g. Cicero, *ad Quint. Frat.* 3.4.5, 3.5.6; Seneca, *Ep.* 33.3; Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.4.39; Martial 2.8; Strabo 13.1.54; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* 1.21.

[16] Iddeng, '*Publica aut peri!*', makes this point well.

[17] The distribution of literature in the provinces is alluded to, directly or indirectly, by Horace (*Carm.* 1.20.13, cf. *Ars poet.* 345–46), Martial (1.1, 7.88, 11.3), Ovid (*Trist.* 4.9.21, 4.10.128) and Pliny (*Ep.* 4.7.2, 9.2.2), and it seems likely that booksellers were often the agents through whom their hopes of broad fame might be realized. Explicit evidence for commercial book dealers in the provinces is scant. Pliny (*Ep.* 9.11.2) speaks of bookshops in Gaul, and we know of book dealers in Egypt (P.Oxy. 2192, P.Petaus 30).

[18] White, 'Bookshops', 276, on the bookshop as 'a reservoir of bibliographic knowledge'.

THE NON-COMMERCIAL BOOK TRADE

Among the well-educated who pursued literary and intellectual interests, a small elite in the empire, the publication and dissemination of texts normally occurred independently of the commercial book trade, by different means and for entirely different reasons.[19] Authors could make their work public in several ways. One might make, or have made at his own expense, several copies of an initial draft of a work and distribute them to a few friends, seeking from them a private reading and response with a view to revising and improving the work. Or, rather than distributing a few copies, one might invite a small group of like-minded friends to a reading (*lectio* or *recitatio*).[20] In a private domestic setting the work, or parts of it, would be read aloud by the author and discussed by the gathered company, whose responses would guide the author in making revisions. In either case, because the author made his work known only to a small group of close acquaintances, the work remained essentially private, under the author's control and subject to revision. Only after the author was satisfied with the responses of friends and had revised the work accordingly would wider circulation be undertaken.[21] Wider circulation could be achieved by holding a more public and formal *recitatio* open to a larger gathering than a few close associates of the author.[22] This was an efficient means of giving a work immediate and wide publicity both within the circles of the literary elite and among others who might be interested, and we may think of this as an initial, albeit oral, form of 'publication'.[23]

But with or without a broadly public *recitatio*, publication in the strict sense of putting a *text* in the public sphere occurred when an author made, or had made for him, one or more fair and final copies of a work and then released them, normally by distributing them to a few friends as gifts, or submitting it to a patron or well-placed dedicatee, or less commonly, by placing such a copy

[19] The now classic concise discussion is Starr, 'Circulation', 213–19.

[20] The *recitatio* was a well-established convention in the literary culture of the early empire, but the term could designate occasions of rather different characters, sizes, constituencies, and purposes, though they all involved a reading before a gathered group. For a recent and nuanced discussion see Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture*, 42–56.

[21] Pliny, *Ep*. 7.17.7, states his procedure: 'I neglect no sort of emendation. First I myself go through the text; then I read it to two or three friends and provide it to others for their comments and, if I am still in doubt, I ponder their criticisms with one or two others; and finally I give a recitation to a larger group and, believe me, that is when I make the most critical revisions.'

[22] On the sizes and constituencies of such recitations see the comments of Iddeng, '*Publica aut peri!*', 61–2; G. Binder, 'Offentliche Autorenlesungen: zur Kommunikation zwischen romischen Autoren und ihrem Publikum', in G. Binder and K. Ehlich, eds., *Kommunikation durch Zeichen und Wort* (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1995), 265–332; and F. Dupont, '*Recitatio* and the Space of Public Discourse', in T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro, eds., *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 44–59.

[23] Sherwin-White (*The Letters of Pliny,* 115) calls the *recitatio* 'the popular form of initial publication, providing the cheapest and quickest means of making works known to the largest educated audience available'.

in the hands of a *librarius* or *biblipola* from whom copies could be procured, or in a state library where it would be available for copying. It was the releasing of a final form of a text by its author that constituted its *ekdosis* (Latin *editio*) or 'publication'.[24] In providing a fair copy to friends or to a patron or to a library an author surrendered any further personal control of the text. Any recipient could make copies or permit copies to be made, as could anyone who came into possession of such a copy. No expense was involved beyond the cost of materials and, if need be, of a scribe. In this way copies began to multiply one by one and to spread at the initiative of persons who had an interest in the work, wished to acquire it and could gain access to a manuscript for copying.

If publication traditionally took place in the context of social relationships between persons interested in texts, so also did the subsequent circulation of texts. Books were ordinarily acquired through sharing and private copying—permitting friends or acquaintances to copy a manuscript of one's own, or having a copy made for them, or assisting them in locating a manuscript that might be available for copying. The richest illustration of this procedure is seen during the late Republic in the relationship between Cicero and T. Pomponius Atticus. A wealthy, highly cultivated, and well-connected equestrian, Atticus was also a prominent bibliophile and text-broker.[25] Possessed of an extensive library and a large staff of literate slaves well-trained in scribal skills, Atticus was in a good position to lend texts to Cicero for copying, to have them copied for Cicero, and to assist Cicero in the publication and dissemination of his works, and Atticus performed such services generously for Cicero and other friends. Atticus was, of course, exceptional in his resources and activities, but the pattern of friends borrowing from or lending to friends texts for copying is well attested in the literary evidence, and was apparently standard practice among the elite.[26] No doubt it persisted deep into the imperial period, both for new and for older works, notwithstanding the growth of the commercial book trade under the early empire.

[24] There were, of course, many instances of texts entering circulation without the knowledge or permission of their authors, hence, apart from the normal means of 'publication'. This happened in cases of texts stenographically derived from speeches or lectures, texts written only for friends or students that were not intended for the public, or texts which, though ultimately intended for the public, had not been put in final form. On unintended or premature publication see the comments and examples in Starr, 'Circulation', 218–19, and White, 'Bookshops', 279.

[25] The once-popular notion of Atticus as a commercial publisher has long been discredited. Beyond the older study of R. Sommer, 'T. Pomponius Atticus und die Verbreitung von Ciceros Werken,' *Hermes* 61 (1926): 389–422, see R. Fehrle, *Das Bibliothekswesen*, 36–44, J. J. Phillips, 'Atticus and the Publication of Cicero's Works,' *CW* 79 (1986) 227–37, and A. Dortmund, *Romisches Buchwesen um die Zeitenwende: War T. Pomponius Atticus (110–32 v. Chr.) Verleger?* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 208–25.

[26] Starr, 'Circulation', 216–18, and Blanck, *Das Buch*, 118–20. The copying itself was done by domestic slaves or freedmen, not by persons of high social status, as shown by M. McDonnell, 'Writing, Copying and Autograph Manuscripts in Ancient Rome', *Classical Quarterly,* 46 (1996): 469–91.

The literary evidence for this practice finds confirmation in some papyri. A papyrus letter from Oxyrhynchus (P.Oxy. 2192) reveals private means of obtaining texts in Egypt in the second century CE.[27] The sender asks a friend to 'Make and send to me copies of books 6 and 7 of Hypsicrates' *Characters in Comedy*. For Harpocration says that they are among the books of Pollio. But it is likely that others also have them. He also has prose epitomes of Thersagorus's *Myths of Tragedy*.' This is followed by a subscription in a different hand: 'According to Harpocration, Demetrius the bookseller has them. I have instructed Apollonides to send me certain of my own books, which [ones] you will find out from him. If you find any volumes of Seleucus's work on *Tenses* that I do not own, make copies and send them to me. Diodorus and his friends also have some that I do not own.' Here we observe a group of friends—scholarly colleagues engaged in the study of drama—who got their books (in this case rather specialized studies) by making copies from exemplars owned by other members of their circle. The bookseller, Demetrius, appears to be a last resort. In another second-century papyrus letter (P.Mil. Vogl. 11) a certain Theon writes to Heraclides that he is 'sending the books you requested through Achilles' (apparently a set of Stoic texts, listed at the end of the letter), and advises him to read them carefully 'since I take great pains to provide you with useful books'. A similar situation is reflected, somewhat less clearly, in a fragmentary second-century papyrus letter that refers to books of Metrodorus and Epicurus being exchanged among Epicurean friends in Egypt.[28]

Once a text had entered into the process of circulation and serial copying its dissemination was gradual, unregulated, and largely haphazard. Absent copyright provisions or other safeguards, texts were routinely subject to the vagaries of careless transcription, revision, plagiarism, excerption, misattribution, and similar misfortunes. Although private channels between friends and acquaintances were usually the most reliable means for locating and acquiring books of special interest, high quality, and careful transcription, even a text acquired in that way could not simply be assumed to be wholly accurate. The serious reader who obtained his books from known and trustworthy sources would nevertheless undertake to correct them where they seemed defective and to collate them, when possible, with other copies that became accessible to him.

Thus the circulation of books characteristically occurred neither commercially nor across a broad and undifferentiated public, but privately along the

[27] The letter, reproduced with comments in E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, ed. P. Parsons (2nd rev. edn. London: University of London Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 114–15, is carefully reconsidered by R. Hatzilambrou, 'P. Oxy. XVIII 2192 Revisited', in A. K. Bowman *et al*., eds., *Oxyrhynchus* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007), 282–6.

[28] J. G. Keenan, 'A Papyrus Letter about Epicurean Philosophy', *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal,* 5 (1977): 91–4. Another but rather later letter (P.Berol. 21849, 5th cent.) also has to do with the practice of lending books among friends.

paths of friendship and personal acquaintance, within and between relatively small circles of persons who were literate and well-educated, who appreciated the value of books, and who employed them in the pursuit of intellectual, aesthetic, or professional interests. Such circles in some cases had a broad appetite for diverse sorts of literature, but in other cases had more focused interests—for example, in philosophy or rhetoric or medicine or philology. Mutual interests in texts did not so much create such networks as play off of existing relationships rooted in factors that defined the upper class—wealth, education, the leisure to read, patronage, and the natural affinities among persons of similar status and pursuits. Among the literary and intellectual elite the production, publication, acquisition, and dissemination of books were functions of *amicitia*—the ties, obligations, and services of friendship: literary culture was deeply embedded in social relationships. The elite circles in which texts played an important, even central, role constituted reading communities—smaller or larger, composed of persons of shared status and interests—within which texts were composed, circulated, read, discussed, analyzed, interpreted, and appreciated. Free of commercial interests and agents, such communities both valued literature for its intellectual and aesthetic values and employed it to confirm, reinforce, and exhibit their own elite standing.[29]

THE PUBLICATION AND DISSEMINATION OF EARLY CHRISTIAN BOOKS

Because the preponderance of evidence for the publication and circulation of books under the empire, both commercial and non-commercial, is found—mostly incidentally—in the works of prominent literary figures such as Pliny, Horace, Martial, Galen, Quintilian, and Aulus Gellius, it has to do with cultivated literature (*belles-lettres*), with reading communities among the social elite, and with Rome and its immediate environs. The more limited papyrological evidence suggests that roughly similar practices obtained in Roman Egypt, and it may be supposed that the same methods for the publication and circulation of texts were operative in the provinces at large. There is no reason to think that Christian texts were subject to peculiar mechanisms; they were produced and disseminated in much the same way as other literature in the larger socio-cultural environment.

[29] On such reading communities and their dynamics the study of Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture*, is richly informative. Having a social context, texts also had a social history, on which see E. Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1996).

Still, some important differences must be noted. Christian communities, far from being cultivated literary circles embedded in pre-existing social relationships, were sub-elite voluntary religious associations, and their literature consisted not of *belles-lettres* but of sub-elite genres—gospels, letters, apocalypses, manuals of church order, hortatory tracts, acts of apostolic figures, and the like. Moreover, as a marginal, largely uncultivated, and indeed counter-cultural minority whose texts had no broad appeal for outsiders, Christianity held no interest for the commercial book trade.[30] Hence it is not surprising that such evidence as we have about how early Christian texts were produced and disseminated points to private channels among Christian communities.

A few examples must suffice. The letters of Paul to his communities, the earliest extant Christian texts, were dictated to scribal associates (presumably Christian), carried to their destinations by a traveling Christian, and read aloud to the congregations.[31] But Paul also envisioned the circulation of some of his letters beyond a single Christian group (cf. Gal. 1: 2, 'to the churches of Galatia', Rom. 1: 7 'to all God's beloved in Rome'—dispersed among numerous discrete house churches, Rom. 16: 5, 10, 11, 14, 15), and the author of Colossians, if not Paul, gives instruction for the exchange of Paul's letters between different communities (Col. 4: 16), which must indeed have taken place also soon after Paul's time.[32] The gospel literature of early Christianity offers only meager hints of intentions or means of its publication and circulation. The prologue to Luke/Acts (Luke 1: 1–4) provides a dedication to 'Theophilus', who (whether or not a fictive figure) by that convention is implicitly made responsible for the dissemination of the work by encouraging and permitting copies to be made. The last chapter of the Gospel of John, an epilogue added by others after the original conclusion of the Gospel (20: 30–1), aims at least in part (21: 24–5) to insure appreciation of the book and to promote its use beyond its community of origin. To take another case, the Apocalypse, addressed to seven churches in western Asia Minor, was almost surely sent in separate copy to each. Even so, the author anticipated its wider

[30] The earliest evidence for commercial dealing in Christian literature belongs to the late 4th cent., when Rufinus (*De adult. lib. Origenis* 41–2 (PG 17, 6282C, 629A)) mentions interpolated codices of Cyprian's epistles being sold in Constantinople.

[31] On the dictation of Paul's letters to a scribe, see E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (WUNT 42; Tubingen: Mohr, 1991), 169–98; for couriers see Rom. 16: 1, 1 Cor. 16: 10, Eph. 6: 21, Col. 4: 7, cf. 2 Cor. 8: 16–17. Reference to their carriers is common in other early Christian letters (e.g. 1 Pet. 5: 12, 1 Clem. 65: 1, Ignatius, *Phil.* 11.2, *Smyr.* 12.1, Polycarp, *Phil.* 14.1). For the general practice see E. Epp, 'New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts and Letter Carrying in Greco-Roman Times', in B. A. Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 35–56. Reading a letter aloud to the community, which seems to be presupposed by all the letters, is stipulated only in 1 Thess. 5: 27.

[32] This is shown for an early time by the generalization of the original particular addresses of some of Paul's letters (Rom. 1: 7, 15; 1 Cor. 1: 2; cf. Eph. 1: 1).

copying and dissemination beyond those original recipients, and so warned subsequent copyists to preserve the integrity of the book, neither adding nor subtracting, for fear of religious penalty (Rev. 22: 18–19). The private Christian copying and circulation that is presumed in these early writings continued to be the means for the publication and dissemination of Christian literature in the second and third centuries. It can be seen, for example, in the explicit notice in *The Shepherd* of Hermas (Vis. 2.4.3) that the book was to be published or released in two final copies, one for local use in Rome, the other for the transcription of further copies to be sent to Christian communities in 'cities abroad'. It can also be seen when Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, had the letters of Ignatius copied and sent to the Christian community in Philippi, and had copies of letters from them and other churches in Asia Minor sent to Syrian Antioch (*Phil.* 13). It is evident too in the scribal colophons of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (22.2–4), and must be assumed also in connection with the letters of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (*fl.* 170 CE; Eusebius, *H.E.* 4.23.1–12).

From another angle, the physical remains of early Christian books show that they were produced and disseminated privately within and between Christian communities. Early Christian texts, especially those of a scriptural sort, were almost always written in codices or leaf books—an informal, economical, and handy format—rather than on rolls, which were the traditional and standard vehicle of all other books. This was a sharp departure from convention, and particularly characteristic of Christians. Also distinctive to Christian books was the pervasive use of *nomina sacra*, divine names written in abbreviated forms, which was clearly an in-house practice of Christian scribes. Further, the preponderance in early Christian papyrus manuscripts of an informal quasi-documentary script rather than a professional bookhand also suggests that Christian writings were privately transcribed with a view to intramural circulation and use.[33]

If Christian books were disseminated in roughly the same way as other books, that is, by private *seriatim* copying, we might surmise that they spread slowly and gradually in ever-widening circles, first in proximity to their places of origin, then regionally, and then transregionally, and for some books this was doubtless the case. But it deserves notice that some early Christian texts appear to have enjoyed surprisingly rapid and wide circulation. Already by the early decades of the second century Papias of Hierapolis in western Asia Minor was acquainted at least with the Gospels of Mark and Matthew (Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.39.15–16); Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna were all acquainted with collections of Paul's letters;

[33] On these features see H. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 66–81, and L. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

and papyrus copies of various early Christian texts were current in Egypt.[34] The *Shepherd* of Hermas, written in Rome near the mid-second century, was current and popular in Egypt not long after.[35] Equally interesting, Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses*, written about 180 in Gaul, is shown by papyrus fragments to have found its way to Egypt by the end of the second century, and indeed also to Carthage, where it was used by Tertullian.[36]

The brisk and broad dissemination of Christian books presumes not only a lively interest in texts among Christian communities but also efficient means for their reproduction and distribution. Such interest and means may be unexpected, given that the rate of literacy within Christianity was low, on average no greater than in the empire at large, namely in the range of 10–15 percent.[37] Yet there were some literate members in almost all Christian communities, and as long as texts could be read aloud by some, they were accessible and useful to the illiterate majority. Christian congregations were not reading communities in the same sense as elite literary or scholarly circles, but books were nevertheless important to them virtually from the beginning, for even before Christians began to compose their own texts, books of Jewish scripture played an indispensable role in their worship, teaching, and missionary preaching. Indeed, Judaism and Christianity were the only religious communities in Greco-Roman antiquity in which texts had any considerable importance, and in this, as in some other respects, Christian groups bore a greater resemblance to philosophical circles than to other religious traditions.[38]

If smaller, provincial Christian congregations were not well-equipped or well-situated for the tasks of copying and disseminating texts, larger Christian

[34] For Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, see A. F. Gregory and C. M. Tuckett, eds., *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 142–53, 162–72, 201–18, 226–7. For early Christian papyri in Egypt see Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, appendix 1 (209–29). The most notable case is 𝔓[52] (a fragment of the Gospel of John, customarily dated to the early 2nd cent.).

[35] Some papyrus fragments of Hermas are 2nd cent. (P.Oxy. 4706 and 3528, P.Mich. 130, P.Iand. 1.4).

[36] For the *A.H.* in Egypt: P.Oxy. 405; for Tertullian's use of *A.H.* in Carthage, see T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 127–8, 220–1.

[37] The fundamental study of literacy in antiquity is still W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989); see now also the essays in J. H. Humphrey, ed., *Literacy in the Roman World* (Journal of Roman Archaeology, suppl. ser. 3; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1991), and in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker, eds., *Ancient Literacies* (Oxford: OUP, 2009).

[38] M. Beard, 'Writing and Religion: Ancient Religion and the Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion', in Humphrey, *Literacy in the Roman World*, 353–8, argues that texts played a relatively large role in Greco-Roman religions, yet characterizes that role as 'symbolic rather than utilitarian', which was clearly not the case in early Christianity. The kind of careful reading, interpretation, and exposition of texts that we see in early Christianity and in early Judaism (whether in worship or school settings) provides, *mutatis mutandis*, an interesting analogy to the activity of elite literary circles.

centers must have had some scriptorial capacity: already in the second century: Polycarp's handling of Ignatius' letters and letters from other churches shows its presence in Smyrna; the instruction about the publication of Hermas' *The Shepherd* suggests it for Rome; and it can hardly be doubted for Alexandria, since even in a provincial city like Oxyrhynchus many manuscripts of Christian texts were available.[39] The early third-century Alexandrian scriptorium devised for the production and distribution of the works of Origen (Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.23.2), though unique in its sponsorship by a private patron and its service to an individual writer, surely had precursors, more modest and yet efficient, in other Christian communities. It also had important successors, not the least of which was the library and scriptorium that flourished in Caesarea in the second half of the third century under the auspices of Pamphilus.[40] Absent such reliable intra-Christian means for the production of books, the range of texts known and used by Christian communities across the Mediterranean basin by the end of the second century would be without explanation.[41]

Just as the missionary proliferation of text-oriented Christian communities during the second and third centuries provided ample incentive to the production and copying of Christian books, the close relationships and frequent contacts that were cultivated between those communities provided efficient means for their dissemination. This circumstance hastened and broadened the circulation of early Christian literature, giving it a vitality and reach that seem extraordinary for books moving through private networks. The metropolitan centers of Christian influence and authority that emerged already by the early second century, including Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, had a role in this, for they were natural nodal points both for the dense accumulation of texts produced elsewhere and for their further distribution. The usefulness, the importance, perhaps even the felt necessity of certain texts for the instruction, governance, worship, mission, and self-defense of Christian congregations, together with the aim of fostering agreement and mutual support among them, gave to the circulation of Christian texts a strongly practical and

[39] On the question of early Christian scriptoria (the term may be variously construed), see Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 121–6. Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 185–9, rightly calls attention to corrections by contemporary hands in early Christian papyri as pointing to at least limited activity of a scriptorial kind.

[40] The role of Pamphilus and the Caesarean library/scriptorium in the private production and dissemination of early Christian literature, esp. of scriptural materials, was highlighted by Eusebius in his *Life of Pamphilus*, as quoted by Jerome in his *Apology against Rufinus* (1.9).

[41] Beyond the uses of Christian texts in congregational settings, there were already in the 2nd cent. some Christian circles that pursued specialized and technical engagements with texts, usually in the service of theological arguments and exegetical agendas. The 'school-settings' of teachers such as Valentinus and Justin, and a little later of Theodotus, Clement, and Origen, were Christian approximations to the kinds of literary activity associated with 'elite' reading communities in the early empire.

occasionally urgent impetus that was lacking with respect to other kinds of books in the larger socio-cultural context. Hence it was not that the early church had a different method for the distribution of its literature, but that by dint of its needs and networks it made highly effective use of an existing system.

In both their copying and progressive distribution Christian texts were, of course, susceptible to the same hazards as all other ancient texts, including inaccurate transcription, revision by additions or omissions, misattribution, and the like. Indeed, it may be that, by reason of their sub-literary social matrix and the influences of divergent theological agendas, Christian texts were more liable than other texts to corruption, both unintentional and intentional.[42] A scribe (or an associate) would ideally review his copy, comparing it to the exemplar he had used, and correct any mistakes of transcription. But this was not always done or done well, and it was incumbent on subsequent users of a book to examine the manuscript carefully and compare it, if possible, with one or more manuscripts of the same work in order to identify defects or differences and then to correct them. Absent a comparable manuscript, a reader had to judge the accuracy of the text by internal considerations. But in either case, determining the correctness of the text was a matter of educated conjecture.[43] Any copy was only relatively better or worse, and it was not ordinarily possible to be fully confident of the accuracy of one's text. It does not appear, incidentally, that books valued as authoritative scripture were any more carefully copied or any more immune to textual corruption than other books.[44]

The large number of variant readings attested for the documents that came to be included in the New Testament arose at an early time, most of them already in the second century. These were inevitable results of the prevailing modes of the production and circulation of books in the Roman Empire. But they also testify to an early and lively private traffic in texts within and between far-flung Christian communities.

[42] The evidence for such corruption is relatively abundant. For scriptural texts, see esp. B. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford: OUP, 1993), with particular reference to texts relevant to Christology. For patristic texts, see e.g. the comments of Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius (*H.E.* 4.23.12), the characterization of the Theodotians quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* 5.28.8–19), or the complaints of Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* 1.1). Christian writers often criticized heterodox teachers for 'falsifying' texts, but textual corruption was by no means confined to them.

[43] To this end the methods of textual, philological, and literary criticism developed mainly by the Alexandrian grammarians began to be employed by educated Christians as early as the 2nd cent. For case studies, see Grant, *Heresy and Criticism* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1993).

[44] G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (London: British Academy, 1953), 268–9, remarks that 'The common respect for the sacredness of the Word, with [Christians], was not an incentive to preserve the text in its original purity. On the contrary, [it] . . . did not prevent the Christians of that age from interfering with their transmitted utterances.'

2

Indicators of 'Catholicity' in Early Gospel Manuscripts

Scott Charlesworth

THE TWO INDICATORS

The remarkable Christian preference for the codex has often been noted.[1] All of the 'early' (i.e. dated up to the third/fourth century) manuscripts of the canonical gospels discovered to date come from papyrus codices with the exception of one roll ($\mathfrak{P}^{22}$) and one parchment codex (0171). Of more significance is the recent discovery that Christians produced early canonical gospels in standard-sized codices.[2] In the second and second/third centuries the preferred size for gospel codices approximated the small Turner Group 9.1 format (W11.5–14 cm × H at least 3 cm higher than W), while in the third century a size approximating the taller but still portable 8.2 Group format (W12–14 cm × H not quite twice W) predominated (see Tables 2.1 and 2.2 below).[3] This finding is remarkable given that *other* early Christian codices were not produced in these formats.[4] While the codex was the preferred

[1] C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (Schweich Lectures, 1977; London: OUP, 1979); C. H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: OUP for the British Academy, 1985), 19–23; L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 43–61, esp. 57–60, has updated the figures of Roberts and Skeat for Christian and non-Christian use of the roll and codex.

[2] See S. D. Charlesworth, 'Public and Private: Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts', in C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias, eds., *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2009), 148–75.

[3] All of the 2nd- and 2nd/3rd-cent. codices including $\mathfrak{P}^{108}$ are of similar size. The 9.1 subgroup is slightly taller than the 'square' Group 9, while 'Group 10 is only a special case in a slightly smaller format of Group 9' (E. G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1977), 25). Likewise, there is little difference between subgroup 8.2 and Group 8 codices (ibid. 20–2).

[4] Examination of the other early Christian codices in Turner's *Typology* reveals that none of the small number of 2nd/3rd-cent. Christian MSS (OT 36, OT 7, OT 9) have the same format as

vehicle for Christian texts in general, gospels seem to have been regarded as a special category. Early Christians acknowledged their importance by using standard-sized codices.

Early Christian use of the unique convention known as *nomina sacra* is also well-known.[5] Roberts[6] argued that there was early consensus about conventional treatment of the four *nomina divina* (*Θεός*, *Ἰηϲοῦϲ*, *Χριϲτός*, *Κύριοϲ*) which was then extended to other words.[7] He explained inconsistency in applying contraction by scribal difficulty in ascertaining whether the referent, meaning, or context was sacred or mundane.[8] This was certainly a factor in the very earliest period, but there is a better explanation for apparent inconsistency in the period covered by our manuscripts. It was decided in the second century that the words causing the interpretative difficulties should be systematically contracted regardless of whether the referent, meaning, or context was sacred or mundane. The goal of this inclusive approach was to bring an end to inappropriate contraction.

When both of these things are considered—standard-sized gospel codices and standardization in the use of *nomina sacra*—the notion of 'catholic' consensus among early Christians becomes more than plausible. Given the evidence that he marshalled, Roberts probably overreached in arguing that there was a significant 'degree of organization, of conscious planning, and uniformity of practice' in the early church.[9] But the early gospel manuscript

2nd/3rd-cent. gospels (Turner Group 9.1). In the 3rd cent., four codices (OT 9, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, 529, and OT 183/207a) are in Turner's Group 8 like several gospels ($\mathfrak{P}^{101}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{121}$), but only OT 75A is in Turner Group 8.2, the preferred size for 3rd-cent. gospels. Moreover, most 3rd- and 3rd/4th-cent. Christian codices are in various other sizes.

5 For bibliography and a recent overview see Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 95–134.

6 For Roberts the *nomina sacra* represent a nascent Christian creed, a kind of 1st-cent. identity statement (*Manuscript*, 28). Along similar lines Hurtado argues that the four earliest *nomina sacra* appear to give visual expression to 'the 'binitarian shape' of earliest Christian piety and devotion' (*Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 106, citing his earlier work including *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 134–53).

7 Roberts identified 'three classes' of words: (1) the four divine names/titles whose contraction was early and 'invariable'; (2) *πνεῦμα*, *ἄνθρωποϲ*, and *ϲταυρόϲ* which are found contracted 'relatively early and frequently'; and (3) *πατήρ*, *υἱόϲ*, *ϲωτήρ*, *μήτηρ*, *οὐρανόϲ*, *Ἰϲραήλ*, *Δαυείδ*, and *Ἰερουϲαλήμ* which are contracted irregularly or inconsistently (*Manuscript*, 27). My own research has shown that in 2nd- and 3rd-cent. gospel MSS *πνεῦμα* is virtually part of Robert's class (1) and *πατήρ* is edging into his class (2): see S. D. Charlesworth, 'Consensus Standardization in the Systematic Approach to *Nomina Sacra* in Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts', *Aegyptus,* 86 (2006): 37–68.

8 Roberts, *Manuscript*, 27. V. Martin and R. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Evangile de Luc chap. 3–24* (Cologny-Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961), 18–19, agree that use of contractions led inevitably to scribal confusion. In contrast, Hurtado contends that there are only 'a comparatively small number of variations and inconsistencies' and that we should not have unrealistic expectations of ancient scribes (*Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 127). For a negative view of inconsistency see C. M. Tuckett, ' "Nomina Sacra": Yes and No?', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. Jonge, eds., *The Biblical Canons* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 431–58.

9 Roberts, *Manuscript*, 41.

evidence now supports this conclusion. The two indicators of 'catholicity' outlined here prove that there was consensus and collaboration between early Christian groups. However, the same manuscript evidence also shows that collaboration had its limits. Variation between manuscripts in the words that were systematically contracted and in the use of lectional aids makes this clear. Therefore, the term 'catholicity', which as used here has no reference to later periods, should be understood to connote cooperative collaboration and not hierarchical uniformity. All of this has far-reaching implications for the 'heterodox'-dominant view of early Christianity.

SYSTEMATIC CONTRACTION OF *NOMINA SACRA*

In early gospel manuscripts the sacred-contraction/mundane-*plene* distinction is always maintained as regards *θεός*, and is not an issue with *Ἰηcοῦc* and *Χριcτόc*. But *κύριοc* presented an interpretative problem. For example, when a slave is found to be faithful and wise at the coming of his owner, should *κύριοc* be contracted or not (Matt. 24: 45–7)? Though the immediate context is strictly mundane or non-sacred, *κύριοc* might be considered sacred in wider context because it is the Son of Man who will come unexpectedly (v. 44). Likewise, who is the *κύριοc* who goes to a far country to receive a kingdom and then return (Luke 19: 12–27, esp. 16, 18, 20, 25)? When other words like *πνεῦμα* and *πατήρ* were added, scribes would have encountered even more problems in deciding whether or not the context required contraction. For instance, does the *πατήρ* of the prodigal son have a sacred referent (Luke 15: 18–24, 32)? And what about the kingdom of heaven being like a certain king who made a marriage for *τῷ υἱῷ* (Matt. 22: 2)? The resultant interpretive blunders led to 'standardization' in the use of *nomina sacra*. This probably took place in the second half of the second century and involved systematic or wholesale contraction of *κύριοc* and several other words such as *πνεῦμα* and *πατήρ*.[10]

For example, in 𝔓[66] every occurrence of *κύριοc* is contracted. (In the following examples sacred are followed by mundane occurrences and separated by a double bar. Compendia are listed in the order nominative, vocative, accusative, genitive, and dative cases.)

- $\overline{κς}$ (4), $\overline{κε}$ (18), $\overline{κν}$ (5), $\overline{κυ}$ (2) || $\overline{κc}$ (15: 15), $\overline{κε}$ (4: 11, 15, 19; 5: 7; 9: 36; 12: 21), $\overline{αυτω}$ $\overline{κε}$ (20: 15), $\overline{υ}$ (13: 16; 15: 20)

Something similar is happening in the treatment of *πατήρ*.

[10] For a much more detailed discussion of what follows see Charlesworth, 'Consensus Standardization', 37–68.

- $\overline{πηρ}$ (37), *πατηρ*, $\overline{περ}$ (5), $\overline{πρ}$, $\overline{πρα}$ (28), *πατερα* (14:16), $\overline{πρc}$ (12), *πατροc* (6: 45), $\overline{πρι}$ (7) || *πατηρ* (4: 53), $\overline{πηρ}$ (6: 42; 8: 39, 56), $\overline{πρεc}$ (4: 20), *πατερεc* (6: 49, 58), *πατροc* (8: 44, 53), $\overline{πρc}$ (4: 12; 8: 38, 41, 44), *πατερων* (7: 22)

Again there seems to be an effort to be comprehensive. However, a number of *plene* occurrences of the word eluded the scribe. Some 3/93 sacred and 6/14 mundane instances were left uncontracted.[11] Association with four divine names might have inspired extension of conventional treatment to other words. For example, the Jews sought even more to put Christ to death because $\overline{πρα}$ *ϊδιον ελεγεν τον* $\overline{θν}$ | *ϊcον εαυτον ποιων τω* $\overline{θω}$ (5: 18). The same background motivation might have led to a mundane contraction at 6: 42, where the scribe has written *και ελε|γον ουχ' ουτοc εcτιν* $\overline{ιc}$ *ο ϋϊοc ϊω|cηφ' ου ημειc οιδαμεν τον* $\overline{πρα}$ ⊠ *τη̄* | *μητερα*, and where the relative pronoun *οὗ* might have been seen to lend *πατέρα* sacred value.

But pious reasons for mundane contraction are inadequate when it comes to John 8. Apart from 4: 12, 20 and 6: 42, the problematic mundane contractions are all in this chapter. *Πατήρ* when used of Abraham as the father of the Jews is contracted three times (8: 39, 53, 56),[12] and when referring to Satan 2/3 times (vv. 38, 41, 44).[13] There are also two sacred contractions (vv. 41–2), and two *plene* mundane occurrences in this chapter (vv. 44a, 53a). These were either the scribe's only moments of clarity in a generally drowsy after-lunch session (a number of uncontracted sacred instances are overlooked, so the scribe would probably be more careless when it came to non-sacred instances), or they slipped under his comprehensive-contraction approach along with a number of others. The latter explanation is undoubtedly more attractive because choosing between sacred or mundane meaning was obviously not a factor. So rather than scribal error resulting in contraction of 8/14 mundane instances, the scribe neglected to contract 6/14 mundane instances. That means that with the goal of contracting all occurrences of *πατήρ* he failed to do so 9/107 times.

The same phenomenon occurs in 𝔓75 in the treatment of *πνεῦμα*.

- $\overline{πνα}$ (11), $\overline{πνc}$ (3), $\overline{πνι}$ (2) || $\overline{πνα}$ (Luke 23: 46; 24: 37, 39; 8: 55; 9: 39; 11: 24; 13: 11; John 3: 6, 8), $\overline{πντα}$ (Luke 11: 26), *πνευματα* (Luke 10: 20), $\overline{πνατων}$ (Luke 6: 18), $\overline{πνι}$ (Luke 8: 29; 9: 42; John 4: 23–4), $\overline{πναcι}$ (Luke 4: 36), $\overline{πνει}$ (John 3: 8)

[11] The scribe is generally consistent in not contracting the mundane occurrences of the plural (6: 49, 58; 7: 22), but writes *οι* $\overline{πρεc}$ *ημων εν τω ορει τουτω προcεκυνηcαν* (4: 20).

[12] The Jewish claim of descendancy from Abraham is rendered *ο* $\overline{πηρ}$ *ημων αβρααμ'* | *εcτιν* (8: 39). Further, we find the Jews asking Jesus *μη cυ μ<ε>ι|ζων ει του π'α'τροc ημων αβρααμ'* | *ο'c'τι'c' απεθανεν* (v. 53), and the penultimate word of Jesus on the matter is *αβρα'α'μ'* | *ο* $\overline{πηρ}$ *ϋμων ηγαλλιαcατο ϊνα ϊ|δη την ημεραν την εμην* (v. 56).

[13] The scribe puts the words of Jesus to the Jews as *ουν α εωρακατε παρα του* $\overline{πρc}$ | *ποιετε* (8:38), and *ϋμειc* | *ποιετε τα εργα του* $\overline{πρc}$ *ϋμων* (v. 41), and finally *ϋμειc εκ του πατροc* | *του διαβολου εcτε και ταc επι|θυμεια του* $\overline{πρc}$ *ϋμων θελεται* | *ποιειν* (v. 44).

Again pious scribal activity may be gravitating outward from the *nomina divina* and extending sacred contraction to associated words. For example, sacred context ($\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ ο $\overline{\theta c}$, 4: 24) and perhaps theological background (cf. Luke 8: 55) might have inspired the scribe to write that true worshippers must do so εν $\overline{\pi\nu\iota}$ και αληθεια (John 4: 23). But all other instances (Luke 4: 36; 6: 18; 8: 29; 9: 39, 42; 10: 20; 11: 24, 26) except one (πνευματα, Luke 13: 11) refer to evil or unclean spirits, yet are contracted and overstroked. As with the contracted use of πατήρ when referring to Satan in $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, there can be no confusion of sacred and mundane distinctions in these cases. Rather, the scribe is treating every occurrence of the word conventionally because of association with the Holy Spirit. That is why the woman had suffered a $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ of infirmity for eighteen years (Luke 13: 11).

The presence of the same approach in all of the larger continuous gospel manuscripts suggests that most were produced in small copying centres[14] where 'policy' dictated some aspects of production.[15] The wholesale approach to contraction represents an effort to produce 'standard' copies of manuscripts (although the usual textual variation would still apply). The further implication is that there was agreement in various places to contract these words systematically. Thus, the manuscripts themselves point to a higher degree of communication and collaboration between early Christian communities and their copying centres than has often been allowed.[16]

Conventional approaches to manuscript production, in terms of codex size and the wholesale contraction of *nomina sacra*, are indicative of an interconnected 'catholic' church in the second half of the second century. (The use of *nomina sacra* by itself cannot be considered an indicator of catholicity because compendia occur in virtually every kind of Christian text and document.) However, the evidence does not appear to support the idea that a conciliar directive specified exactly what words were to be systematically contracted. Rather, variation in the words so treated from manuscript to manuscript suggests that there was consensus adoption of a limited number of words. $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ contract κύριος, πνεῦμα, πατήρ, σταυρός, and σταυρόω systematically,[17] while $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ treats κύριος, πνεῦμα, and Ἰσραήλ

[14] See A. Mugridge, 'What is a Scriptorium?', in J. Frösén *et al.*, eds., *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1–7 August, 2004* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2007), 781–92, who shows that the word 'scriptorium' or a Greek equivalent was not used in the early period.

[15] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ is the exception: see Charlesworth ('Public and Private', 163–7) and Table 2.2 below.

[16] On the movement of written communications and manuscripts between early Christian groups see H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 108–32. See also M. B. Thompson, 'The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation', in R. J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 49–70; and L. Alexander, 'Ancient Book Production and Circulation of the Gospels', ibid. 71–105.

[17] Note that both σταυρός and σταυρόω occur only once in $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$.

systematically, but not *πατήρ*, *ϲταυρόϲ*, and *ϲταυρόω*. Such differences illustrate that 'catholic' collaboration took the form of consensus, rather than formal, detailed agreement. This conclusion is confirmed by the variety of text division markers used in controlled settings.

OTHER ASPECTS OF CHRISTIAN SCRIBAL CULTURE

The codices in Table 2.1 share a number of common characteristics—uniformity in size, hands in the semi-literary to (formative) biblical majuscule range, and the use of text division and punctuation as readers' aids.[18] When these three factors are present as a group, especially in tandem with checking and correction, the manuscript was probably produced in a 'controlled' setting for public use in Christian gatherings (perhaps, as mentioned above, in small copy centres comprised of two or more scribes[19]). All of these things add up to quality control. Systematic contraction (not simply the presence) of *nomina sacra* may be another sign of controlled production.[20] It implies production that is to some extent policy-driven, something that quality control also implies.

In contrast, codices with informal or documentary hands[21] which lack features conducive to public reading, even though they may be conventional in size, were probably copied in uncontrolled settings for private use.[22] For example, the unconventional sizes of 𝔓^{52} and 𝔓^{45} point to uncontrolled production. The same is true of 𝔓^{111}, 𝔓^{119}, and 𝔓^{37}, but like the remaining third-century codices there are additional reasons for their 'private' designation—

[18] Readers' aids, lectional signs, and punctuation were developed from the 2nd cent. BC onwards to assist word recognition within continuous rows of letters: G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Hellenistic Bookhands* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 17, 19–21. For detailed discussion of what follows see Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 149–52.

[19] Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 120–1; G. Zuntz, 'The Text of the Epistles', in id., *Opuscula Selecta* (Manchester: MUP, 1972), 252–68, esp. 266–8; id., *The Text of the Epistles: a Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (Schweich Lectures, 1946; Oxford: OUP, 1953), 271–5; Roberts, *Manuscript*, 24.

[20] Charlesworth, 'Consensus Standardization', 66. 𝔓^{45}, which has been designated private/uncontrolled, is an exception: see n. 15.

[21] We can visualize broad but non-exclusive categories of 2nd- and 3rd-cent. hands ranging from literary and semi-literary through informal to documentary and scholarly. W. A. Johnson's three categories of hands parallel those used here: (1) 'formal, semi-formal, or pretentious'; (2) 'informal and unexceptional'; (3) 'substandard or cursive': *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 102; cf. 161. The vast majority of literary rolls in his samples fall into the first and second categories.

[22] The categories of 'public/controlled' and 'private/uncontrolled' should not be seen as inflexible classifications to be imposed on the evidence. A manuscript might be used in both public and private settings, or an individual might make or obtain a copy of a 'public' manuscript for 'private' use or vice versa. But, in general, the documentary evidence can be divided into public and private categories.

Table 2.1. 'Public' Gospel Manuscripts

MS	Gospel(s)	Turner Group	Hand[a]	Text Division[b]	Use/Prod.[c]
2nd century					
𝔓103	Matt	10	semi-lit., bk←	·	pub./c
𝔓77	Matt	10	semi-lit., bk←	· pg. vac. ek.?	pub./c
𝔓90	John	9.1	semi-lit., bk←	ek. en. sp.?	pub./c
𝔓104	Matt	9.1	formal round	sp.?	pub.?/c
𝔓64 + 67	Matt	9.1	bibl. majuscule	· : ek.	pub./c
2nd/3rd century					
𝔓4	Luke	9.1	bibl. maj.	· : ek. pg.	pub./c
𝔓66	John	9	decorated round	· : ʾ > - , vac. ek. sp.	pub./c
3rd century					
𝔓108	John	9.1	semi-lit., bk←	?	pub.?/c?
𝔓75	Luke, John	8	elegant maj.	· : > sp. ek. pg.	pub./c
𝔓121	John	8	semi-lit., bk←	sp	pub.?/c?
𝔓95	John	8.2	bibl. maj.	nil	pub.?/c?
𝔓70	Matt	8.2	semi-lit., bk←	sp.	pub.?/c?
𝔓5	John	8.2	semi-lit., →doc.	sp.	pub./c
𝔓39	John	8.2	bibl. maj.	sp.	pub./c
3rd/4th century[d]					
𝔓102	Matt	8	semi-lit., bk←	·	pub./c

[a] bk = literary (lit.)/bookhand; doc. = documentary/cursive hand (with arrows indicating whether it is closer to a bk← or →doc. hand); inf. = informal hand (which is in between [↔] the other two hands).

[b] pg. = *paragraphos*; vac. = vacant line ends; ek. = *ekthesis*; en. = enlarged first letter of (sub)section; sp. = space; · = medial/high point; : = dicolon; ʾ = apostrophe or line filler; > = diple line filler; and ˏ = text division marker or miscellaneous stroke.

[c] In Tables 2.1 and 2.2 the intended use is either public (pub.) or private (priv.) and the type of production controlled (= c) or uncontrolled (= u).

[d] 𝔓22 (roll) and 0171 (parchment codex) are excluded from Tables 2.1 and 2.2 along with five later MSS. **(1)** 0162 (P.Oxy. 6.847, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 09.182.43) is dated IV by Grenfell and Hunt (*P. Oxy*. 6 (1908), 4), J. van Haelst (*Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (1976), no. 436), and Turner (*Typology*, 157). **(2)** 𝔓35 (PSI 1.1, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence) is dated V/VI by G. Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (1967), 115, and G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period* (1987), 22, who say that the hand is an example of 'fully-fledged "Alexandrian majuscule" ', the first traces of which appear in the 2nd cent., but which 'does not reach its ideal form until the V/VI century' (23; cf. 5). **(3)** 𝔓62 (P.Oslo. inv. 1661, University Library, Oslo) is very probably 4th-cent. It is dated early IV, L. Amundsen, 'Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection', *SO* 24 (1945), 121–40; IV, K. Aland and B. Aland (*The Text of the New Testament* (²1989), 100), van Haelst (*Catalogue*, no. 359); IV(?), Turner, *Typology*, 148. **(4)** 𝔓80 (P.Monts.Roca inv. 83, Abadia de Montserrat) is probably 5th cent. or later as are other MSS of John containing *hermeneiai*: see D. C. Parker, 'Manuscripts of John's Gospel with *Hermeneiai*', in J. W. Childers and D. C. Parker, eds., *Transmission and Reception* (2006), 51. Cf. V–VI, Turner, *Typology*, 150. **(5)** 𝔓7 (Petrov 553, Kiev, Ukrainian National Library, F. 301 (KDA)) was dated V (von Soden) and IV–VI (Gregory), but it was never photographed and was lost during the Second World War: see K. Aland, *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments* (1967), 137–40, who agrees with Gregory's classification of the MS as either a homily or a commentary and therefore not a NT papyrus (C. E. Hill kindly provided this reference).

informal or documentary hands and a lack of punctuation and readers' aids. Yet in most cases standard sizes were still preferred, suggesting that convention was strong enough to dictate size even as the number of private copies of the gospels increased. Perhaps the same thing might be said of systematic contraction of

Table 2.2. Private' Gospel Manuscripts

Ms	Gospel(s)	Turner Group	Hand	Text Division	Use/Prod.
2nd century					
$\mathfrak{P}^{52}$	John	5^{Ab}	semi-lit., bk←	sp.?	priv./u
3rd century					
$\mathfrak{P}^{101}$	Matt	8	inf., bk↔doc.	nil	?/?
$\mathfrak{P}^{69}$	Luke	8.1	inf., bk↔doc.	?	priv./u
$\mathfrak{P}^{53}$	Matt	8.2	near doc./curs.	sp.?	priv.?/u?
$\mathfrak{P}^{107}$	John	8.2	semi-curs., doc.	?	priv.?/u?
$\mathfrak{P}^{106}$	John	8.2	non-lit., →doc.	nil	priv./u
$\mathfrak{P}^{109}$	John	8.2	non-lit., unprof.	nil	priv.?/u?
$\mathfrak{P}^{1}$	Matt	8.2	inf., bk↔doc.	·	priv./u
$\mathfrak{P}^{28}$	John	8.2	→doc./curs.	nil	priv./u
$\mathfrak{P}^{111}$	Luke	7	semi-doc.	nil	priv./u
$\mathfrak{P}^{119}$	John	5	inf., bk↔doc.	nil	priv.?/u?
$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$	Matt-John	4	elegant maj.	· ’	priv./u
3rd/4th century					
$\mathfrak{P}^{37}$	Matt	7	doc./cursive	sp.? ’	priv./u

nomina sacra because it occurs in 'private' manuscripts like $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$. But this cannot be verified because only singular instances of contraction in mundane contexts occur in less well-preserved papyri.[23]

The 'culture of standardization' visible in the two 'catholic' indicators discussed above did not extend to these other aspects of scribal culture. This is perhaps understandable when manuscripts were being copied in private/uncontrolled settings. But even among public/controlled manuscripts there is no standardized use of punctuation and readers' aids. In the case of text division, local approaches seem to have had precedence over what may have pertained elsewhere. The use of text division seems to have been both conventional *and* individual in that practice varied at the local level. As with variation in the words that were systematically contracted, the degree of collaboration evident in the standardized features of early gospels needs to be qualified by the implications of conventional, but far from systematized, text division. That is, 'standardization' seems to have proceeded so far and no further, and this may be illustrative of the situation at large, which can be described as informal sharing or 'consensus' rather than formal agreement.

[23] The sole contractions in mundane contexts of *πνεῦμα* in $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ ($\overline{\pi\nu\iota}$) and $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$ ($\overline{\pi\nu}[\overline{\alpha}]$) and of *ἄνθρωποϲ* in $\mathfrak{P}^{22}$ ($\overline{\alpha\nu\varsigma}$) and $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$ ($\underset{\cdot}{\overline{\alpha}}[\overline{\nu}]\overline{\epsilon}$) may or may not be evidence of systematic contraction. Note that of these four MSS only $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ has been designated public/controlled.

MEDITERRANEAN TEXTS

Conservative scribal desire for a shared culture is evident on another front. Cavallo and Maehler have used the Herculaneum papyri in particular to 'contribute to the reconstruction of a typology of scripts that is *Hellenistic* rather than *Ptolemaic*'.[24] Their analysis demonstrates that literary scripts of the Hellenistic and early Roman period 'developed along very similar lines' in Egypt and southern Italy (Herculaneum). Indeed, there may have been, to use their word, a *koiné* of Greek literary scripts across the Mediterranean world.[25] The implication is that literary scripts were common scribal property, like the Christian scribal conventions discussed above.[26]

The ancient world lacked 'an organised and systematic system for the conveyance of personal correspondence'.[27] Individual senders had to look out for travellers, known or otherwise, who may or may not be reliable, to deliver their letters.[28] Paul preferred to use associates, who often doubled as his emissaries, as letter-carriers (see 1 Cor. 4: 17; 2 Cor. 8: 16–24; 9: 3–5; Phil. 2: 25–30; cf. Eph. 6: 21–2; Col. 4: 7–9).[29] But from the second century AD letter-carriers were apparently not too hard to find since correspondents are 'quick to accuse each other of neglect in writing'.[30] Gospel manuscripts must have moved around the Roman world by the same means. For example, if 𝔓52 were copied in or came to Egypt soon after it was copied, the Gospel of John, though apparently written in western Asia Minor,[31] was known in Egypt by (or before) the middle of the second century.[32] Rather than just being examples

[24] Cavallo and Maehler, *Hellenistic Bookhands*, 6. Texts written in Greek have also been found in Derveni (Macedonia) and Qumran.

[25] Cavallo and Maehler, *Hellenistic Bookhands*, 16–17.

[26] Cavallo and Maehler suggest that this may have been 'due to intensified cultural exchanges as a result of more intense political and economic relations between the Romans and the Hellenistic world' (*Hellenistic Bookhands*, 16).

[27] S. R. Llewelyn, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vii (Sydney: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1994), 1–57, here 51; id., 'Sending Letters in the Ancient World', *TynBul* 46 (1995): 337–56; H.-J. Klauck, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament* (1998; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 60–5. The Roman *cursus publicus* or state postal service was 'intended only for the purposes of the government, administration, and military' (Klauck, *Ancient Letters*, 63).

[28] 'The wealthy could send their own slaves or avail themselves of independent couriers, the so-called *tabellarii*... There were also private tax collectors... [who] maintained their own courier service which they shared with others for a price. Family members, friends, merchants, soldiers—all could be given letters when they went on journeys' (ibid. 63).

[29] See Llewelyn, *New Documents*, 51–7, for discussion of the delivery of New Testament and non-canonical letters.

[30] Llewelyn, *New Documents*, 27, citing H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee and Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr*. (Helsinki: Finnish Academy, 1956), 64–7. Private letters found their way to Egypt from all parts of the Mediterranean world: see E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Oxford: OUP, 1968; rev. edn. 1980), 50–1, 96.

[31] See Irenaeus, *Haer*. 3.1.1.

[32] Roberts urged caution but listed an impressive array of papyrological authorities who supported his 100–150 dating: see C. H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel*

of local texts,[33] manuscripts of Egyptian provenance probably represent gospel texts from around the Mediterranean world.[34] Thus, shared scripts and the mobility of manuscripts provide further support for the idea that the two scribal conventions under discussion are indeed indicators of 'catholicity'.

'CATHOLIC' *AND* 'ORTHODOX'?

The evidence for later second- and second/third-century 'catholicity' presents real problems for the Bauer thesis.[35] Did the Gnostic, Montanist, and Marcionite groups, which he claims dominated early Christianity[36], reach a consensus about conventional approaches to manuscript production in the second half of the second century? This is highly improbable when each group was busy insisting on its own version of Christianity[37] and when early non-canonical gospel papyri[38] are private manuscripts without indications of catholicity.[39]

in the John Rylands Library (Manchester: MUP, 1935), 16; id., 'An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library', *BJRL* 20 (1936): 44–55 (47); id., *P.Ryl.* 3 (1938): 1–3. Turner (*Typology*, 100) accepted Roberts's dating and G. Cavallo (*Il Calamo e il Papiro* (Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2005), 183, 198) dates the papyrus to *c.*150. In contrast B. Nongbri argues, also on palaeographical grounds, that 'any serious consideration of the window of possible dates for 𝔓[52] must include dates in the later second and early third centuries': 'The Use and Abuse of 𝔓[52]: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel', *HTR* 98 (2005): 46.

[33] So e.g. K.W. Clark, *The Gentile Bias and Other Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 127: 'All the manuscripts so far discovered, including the most sensational of recent discoveries, may enable us to recover no more than the early text in Egypt.'

[34] E. J. Epp, 'New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts and Letter Carrying in Greco-Roman Times', in B. A. Pearson *et al.*, *The Future of Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 35–56.

[35] See W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Early Christianity*, tr. Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins (ed. R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971). Bauer's atmospherics underlie the perspective of B. D. Ehrman in particular: see his *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York: OUP, 1993), 3–46. Cf. W. L. Petersen, 'The Diatessaron and the Fourfold Gospel', in C. Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 50–68.

[36] Bauer argued that in the 2nd cent. central and eastern Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Mesopotamia were dominated by heresy (*Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 170–2, 192–3). Indeed, 'heresy constituted Christianity *to such a degree* that a confrontation with the ecclesiastical faith [i.e., orthodoxy] was not necessary and was scarcely even possible' (p. 170).

[37] Bauer wrongly asserts that each version of Christianity had its own gospel (*Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 203).

[38] There are early papyri of two *known* non-canonical gospels: (1) *Gospel of Thomas*—P.Oxy. 4.654 (British Library, London, Pap. 1531), opisthographic roll; P.Oxy. 1.1 (Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Gr. th e. 7[P]), codex; P.Oxy. 4.655 (Houghton Library, Harvard University, SM 4367), roll. (2) *Gospel of Mary*—P.Oxy. 50.3525 (Papyrology Rooms, Sackler Library, Oxford), roll; P.Ryl. 3.463 (John Rylands Library, Manchester, Greek Papyrus 463), codex. Whether the following papyri are early evidence for the *Gospel of Peter* is contested—P.Oxy. 41.2949 (Papyrology Rooms, Sackler Library, Oxford), roll; P.Oxy. 60.4009 (Papyrology Rooms, Sackler Library, Oxford), codex. Of papyri possibly from *unknown* gospels, the so-called Egerton Gospel has received the most attention—P. Egerton inv. 2 (British Museum, London, P.Egerton 1/P.Lond. Christ. 1) + P.Köln 6.255 (Institut für Altertumskunde, Universität Köln, inv. 608), codex.

[39] See S. D. Charlesworth, *Early Christian Gospels* (forthcoming).

Non-canonical gospels are also at a serious disadvantage in terms of frequency of citation[40] and preservation.[41] If the 'heterodox' were in the majority for so long, non-canonical gospels should have been preserved in greater numbers in Egypt.[42] But the earliest papyri provide 'no support for Bauer's view'.[43] Therefore, scribal conventions in second- and second/third-century gospel papyri are indicative of 'catholic' collaboration and consensus, presumably among the 'orthodox'.[44]

As part of his imaginative analysis Bauer often assumed that literary texts represented larger Christian groups or factions and not just their authors.[45]

[40] If non-canonical gospels had as much or indeed more currency than the canonical gospels, we should expect to find frequent citations or allusions in the Apostolic Fathers and 2nd-cent. writers. But the *Gospel of Mary* and the *Gospel of Peter* are not cited by any known writer. Even the *Gospel of Thomas* has only two early 3rd-cent. citations: one which purports to be a quotation from the *Gospel according to Thomas* used by the Naassenes is more allusion than citation (Hipp., *Haer*. 5.7.20//*GThomas* 4; *c*.222–35), while the other (apparently from the same source) is again similar but worded quite differently (Hipp., *Haer*. 5.8.32//*GThomas* 11b). The only two close parallels are both 4th-cent. (Didymus, *Comm. Ps*. 88.8//*GThomas* 82; Macarius, *Logia* 55.5//*GThomas* 113). See H. W. Attridge, 'The Greek Fragments', in B. Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2–7, together with XIII,2, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926 (1) and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655* (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 103–9; D. Lührmann with E. Schlarb, *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache* (Marburg: Elwert, 2000), 131.

[41] After excluding 𝔓^{7} and including P. Papyrus inv. 2, in terms of preservation the four canonical gospels outnumber the four non-canonical gospels by more than 4 to 1 (35 canonical gospel to 8 non-canonical gospel fragments). If P. Oxy. 41.2949 and 60.4009 are not early fragments of the *Gospel of Peter*, the ratio is 5.8 to 1. When comparison is made with the *Gospel of Thomas* alone, the figures are: John (16), Matthew (12), Luke (6), Thomas (3), Mark (1). However, in terms of the conventional vehicle for gospels, Luke is preserved in six codices and the *Gospel of Thomas* in only one. Preference for Matthew probably explains the lack of Marcan papyri.

II Matt (𝔓$^{64+67}$ 𝔓^{77} 𝔓^{103} 𝔓^{104}), John (𝔓^{52} 𝔓^{90}), *GPeter* (P. Oxy. 60.4009), Egerton Pap. 2 + P. Köln 6.255

II/III Luke (𝔓^{4}), John (𝔓^{66}), Peter (P. Oxy. 41.2949), *GThomas* (P. Oxy. 1.1)

III Matt (𝔓^{1} 𝔓^{45} 𝔓^{53} 𝔓^{70} 𝔓^{101}), Mark (𝔓^{45}), Luke (𝔓^{45} 𝔓^{69} 𝔓^{75} 𝔓^{111}), John (𝔓^{5} 𝔓^{22} 𝔓^{28} 𝔓^{39} 𝔓^{45} 𝔓^{75} 𝔓^{95} 𝔓^{106} 𝔓^{107} 𝔓^{108} 𝔓^{109} 𝔓^{119} 𝔓^{121}), *GThomas* (P. Oxy. 4.654, 655), *GMary* (P. Oxy. 50.3525, P.Ryl. 3.463)

III/IV Matt (𝔓^{37} 𝔓^{102} 0171), Luke (0171)

[42] See Roberts's comments on the preservation of Gnostic papyri (*Manuscript*, 51–2).

[43] B. A. Pearson, *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 13–14. See also B. A. Pearson, 'Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations', in B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring, eds., *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1986), 132–59; id., 'Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Further Observations', in J. E. Goehring and J. A. Timbie, eds., *The World of Early Egyptian Christianity* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 97–112. On alleged Gnostic preference for the Gospel of John in Egypt see C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: OUP, 2004); and J. Chapa, 'The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Gospel of John in Egypt', *VC* 64 (2010): 327–52.

[44] The terms 'orthodoxy' and 'heterodoxy' carry too much baggage from the later period to encapsulate adequately the general naiveté of the earliest period. In general, earliest Christianity tolerated diversity. Proto-orthodoxy developed into orthodoxy through the escalating conflict with increasingly extreme heterodoxy.

[45] T. A. Robinson, *The Bauer Thesis Examined* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 36–42; cf. W. Völker, 'Walter Bauer's *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*', tr. T. P. Scheck,

Such an approach is only credible when there is sufficient weight of evidence.[46] The combination of evidence adduced here shows that conventional textual practices were already established among 'catholic' Christians by the second half of the second century[47] when standard-sized codices of the canonical gospels were being produced for public use in Christian gatherings.[48] Despite an increase in the number of private manuscripts, a similar situation pertained in the third century. Questions about unity and diversity in relation to geographical areas will have to be left for others to answer.

JECS 14 (2006): 399–405 (= *ZKG* 54 (1935): 628–31). For surveys of scholarly reaction see G. Strecker, 'The Reception of the Book', revised and augmented by R. A. Kraft, in Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 286–316; D. J. Harrington, 'The Reception of Walter Bauer's *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* during the last Decade', *HTR* 73 (1980): 289–98; M. R. Desjardins, 'Bauer and Beyond: On Recent Scholarly Discussions of *hairesis* in the Early Christian Era', *SecCent* 8 (1991): 65–82. For a recent critique see A. J. Köstenberger and M. J. Kruger, *The Heresy of Orthodoxy* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2010).

[46] F. Wisse, 'The Use of Early Christian Literature as Evidence for Inner Diversity and Conflict', in C. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr., eds., *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986), 177–90.

[47] *Contra* R. S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: PUP, 2009), the standard sizes of 2nd- and 3rd-cent. gospel codices confirm the dates generally assigned by papyrologists.

[48] Justin's statement that the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων (*1 Apol.* 67.3; *Dial.* 103.8, 106.3, etc.) ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια (*1 Apol.* 66.3; cf. *Dial.* 10.2; 100.1) were read at mid-2nd-cent. Christian services for the instruction of those gathered (*1 Apol.* 67.3–4) appears to have had wider application than just Rome.

3

Manuscripts and the Sociology of Early Christian Reading

Larry Hurtado

I

In this chapter, I take a cue from a programmatic and path-breaking study by William A. Johnson, 'Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity', in which he cogently argued that previous attempts to portray reading in the Roman era were too generalized, and that

> The more proper goal . . . is to understand the particular reading cultures that obtained in antiquity, rather than to try to answer decontextualized questions that assume in 'reading' a clarity and simplicity it manifestly does not have.[1]

In the concluding lines of his study, Johnson urges that 'we urgently need . . . to frame our discussions of reading, whether ancient or modern, within highly specific sociocultural contexts'.[2]

Johnson chose to focus on 'the reading of Greek literary prose texts by the educated elite during the early empire (first and second centuries AD)', freely acknowledging, however, that it was one of a number of specific 'reading cultures' of the time.[3] In the much more modest and exploratory study that follows, I focus on the particular 'reading culture' comprised of Christians in the first three centuries. I shall argue that there is a distinguishable Christian reading-culture, another 'specific sociocultural context', and that early Christian manuscripts are direct artefacts of it. The comparison is appropriate, for

[1] William A. Johnson, 'Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity', *AJP* 121 (2000): 593–627 (quotation from 606).

[2] Ibid. 625. Evidently, for Johnson, elite social circles considered collectively comprised a 'highly specific' reading context. So I trust that it will be equally appropriate to treat early Christian circles broadly as well as another specific reading context.

[3] Ibid. 606.

early Christians were particularly given to the reading of certain literary texts (especially those that functioned for them as scriptures) in their gatherings, as we know from a variety of Christian references of the time (e.g. Col. 4: 16; 1 Tim. 4: 13). Indeed, as Harry Gamble showed in his magisterial study of early Christian books and readers, the production, copying, circulation, and reading of texts was a remarkably prominent part of early Christian activities.[4]

Perhaps the most intriguing contribution of Johnson's essay was his argument that the typical format of high-quality Greek prose-text manuscripts was intended to reflect and validate the elite nature of the reading groups in which they were to be read. Taking his analysis of this matter as sound, I wish to consider here the formatting of earliest Christian literary-text manuscripts with a view to considering how they, too, likely reflect the nature of the circles in which they were to be read. We shall see that there are striking differences in format between the manuscripts that Johnson considered and those addressed here. I shall argue that these differences were deliberate, and that the format-features of earliest Christian manuscripts reflect and affirm the very different socio-cultural character of the Christian circles of the time. Before we turn to the Christian manuscripts and their features, however, it will be helpful to take further notice of Johnson's analysis of pagan prose literary manuscripts and what they tell us about the ancient readers for whom they were intended.

It is well known that high-quality Greek prose-text manuscripts of the Roman era were in a format that seems to us (and rightly so) to have made huge demands on readers. The most obvious feature, *scriptio continua*, required readers to form words in an uninterrupted flow of Greek alphabetic characters, with no word-division or sense-unit demarcation, and typically no punctuation. This format is especially noteworthy, given that copies of ancient school exercises often have word-division, and 'elaborate visual structural markers' appear often in documentary texts and inscriptions. Moreover, Hebrew manuscripts of the time, such as the Qumran texts, have word-separation and spaces to indicate sense-units. Indeed, in copies of Roman literary texts prior to the period under consideration here, 'word separation is the norm, in fact universal so far as we know'.[5] This latter datum makes it all the more interesting that in the centuries we are concerned with here the Romans departed from word-separation and adopted *scriptio continua*. As Johnson observed, this is 'a choice they would hardly have made if it interfered fundamentally with the Roman reading system'.[6] So, assuming that Romans were not stupid, the deliberate move to this rather demanding format must

[4] H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

[5] Johnson, 'Toward a Sociology of Reading', 608. Johnson cites E. Otha Wingo, *Latin Punctuation in the Classical Age* (The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1972).

[6] Johnson, 'Toward a Sociology of Reading', 609.

have served something in the ancient reading-culture. In short, prose literary texts were not formatted in *scriptio continua* because the ancients were incapable of thinking of a less demanding way of presenting texts for reading. Instead, Johnson cogently contends, this format was intended to reflect and serve the specific elite cultural settings in which the texts were to be read.

This will become still clearer if we take further note of the visual features of these manuscripts.[7] They were typically not codices but handwritten rolls, held horizontally between the hands, the texts written in vertical columns ranging from 4.5 to 7.0 centimetres in width, about 15–25 letters per line, left and right justification, and about 15–25 centimetres in height, with about 1.5–2.5 centimetres spacing between columns. The letters were carefully written, calligraphic in better quality manuscripts, but with no spacing between words, little or no punctuation, and no demarcation of larger sense-units. The strict right-hand justification was achieved by 'wrapping' lines (to use a computer term), ending each line either with a given word or a syllable, and continuing with the next word or syllable on the next line, the column 'organized as a tight phalanx of clear, distinct letters, each marching one after the other to form an impression of continuous flow, the letters forming a solid, narrow rectangle of written text, alternating with narrower bands of white space'.[8] As Johnson observed,

> The product seems, to the modern eye, something almost more akin to an art object than a book; and, with its lack of word spaces and punctuation, the ancient bookroll is, to the modern perception, spectacularly, even bewilderingly, impractical and inefficient as a reading tool. But that the ancient reading and writing systems interacted without strain is indisputable: so stable was this idea of the literary book, that with only small variations it prevailed for at least seven hundred years in the Greek tradition. The economical hypothesis is that the reading culture was likewise stable, and that readers were so thoroughly comfortable with the peculiarities of the writing system that adjustments . . . proved unnecessary over a great deal of time.[9]

Johnson probed further the visual qualities of literary bookrolls, pointing to 'the beauty of the letter shapes, and the elegant precision of placement for the columns', which reflect '[t]he elaborate care taken by scribes in the production of a literary prose text', achieving 'an elegant harmony that speaks loudly to aesthetic sensibilities'. In his words, 'That the physical literary roll not only

[7] I draw directly here on Johnson's concise summary, 'Toward a Sociology of Reading', 609–10. For fuller discussion, see E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 2nd edn., rev. P. J. Parsons (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987); and now especially the detailed study by W. A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).

[8] Johnson, 'Toward a Sociology of Reading', 609.

[9] Ibid. 609–10. As Johnson shows, this means that modern proposals that texts were not read out loud but were memorized and declaimed orally are very dubious.

contained high culture, but was itself an expression of high culture, does not need to be argued at length. The product itself makes it fairly obvious.'[10] Johnson then shows that in the cultured circles in which such manuscripts were used, 'the use of literary texts . . . is deeply rooted in that sense of refined aesthetic enjoyment so formative in the interior construction of a cultural elite'. He makes an interesting comparison with the way that opera functions in contemporary elite culture, 'the very difficulty serv[ing] to validate the activity as one exclusive to the educated and cultured'.[11]

Having noted that the reading of such prose texts was a favoured feature of social gatherings of the cultural elite, he emphasizes that in these settings 'it was the *reader's* job [emphasis his] to bring the text alive, to insert the prosodic features and illocutionary force lacking in the writing system'. He goes on to observe that '[t]he reader played the role of performer, in effect, and the sort of direction for pause and tone given by the author's para-linguistic markup in our texts (commas, quotes, italics, indentation, etc.) was left to the reader's interpretation of the lines'. In short, 'A surprising amount of the burden to interpret the text was shifted from author to reader'.[12] The ability to rise to this challenge is part of what marked off very skilled readers from others.

It will be important for what follows also to take account of Johnson's observations that in the ancient Roman setting reading is 'tightly bound up in the construction of the community', and that '[r]eading of literary prose, often difficult and inaccessible to the less educated, is part of that which fences off the elite group from the rest of society'.[13]

II

Taking Johnson's study as the basis, in what follows I offer a complementary (but much more modest) pilot-study of the reading of literary texts in worship gatherings of Christian circles of the first three centuries. As in Johnson's study, I wish to draw particular attention to the visual features of earliest Christian manuscripts as reflective of the social character of the early Christian circles that used them, and perhaps also as indicative of a deliberate effort to format Christian texts in a manner that contrasts with the sort of elite-oriented copies that were Johnson's focus.

[10] Ibid. 612.

[11] Ibid. 615.

[12] Phrasing cited in this paragraph all from ibid. 620. Johnson notes (n. 39) the extant MSS that have punctuation and other readers' aids added by their users, evidence of the preparatory work that readers did to deliver the text appropriately.

[13] Ibid. 623.

The Social Setting of Early Christian Reading

As noted already, we know from various sources that the reading of certain texts formed a frequent part of the worship gatherings of Christian believers. I trust that it will be sufficient to provide some limited illustration of this, especially given the impressive treatment of the matter by Gamble.[14] In addition to the references to the reading of texts in Christian worship gatherings already cited, note also Paul's demand that his letter to the Thessalonian church be read 'to all the brothers' (1 Thess. 5: 27), and Justin's description of Christian assemblies in the mid-second century, in which he states that 'the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read for as long as time permits', followed by an address by 'the president' (*1 Apol.* 1.67). Indeed, Edwin Judge showed that the place of preaching/teaching in Christian gatherings (activity often connected to the reading of sacred texts) led to some pagan observers likening these more to philosophical circles than religious ones.[15]

We also know something of the social character of Christian circles of the first few centuries, although certainly not as much as we could wish. Starting with evidence of first-century churches, it seems that they typically involved a diversity of people: free(d) and slaves, males and females, older and younger people, and a variety of socio-economic levels from workers to small/medium property owners and owners of businesses and, occasionally, individuals of some wealth and modest social status.[16] As Meeks observed in his study of Pauline churches, 'The extreme top and bottom of the Greco-Roman social scale are missing from the picture', with 'no landed aristocrats, no senators, *equites*, nor (unless Erastus might qualify) decurions'. Likewise, 'There may well have been members of the Pauline communities who lived at the subsistence level, but we hear nothing of them'. Social strata in between the extremes are, however, 'well represented', including slaves. But in the Pauline letters, 'The "typical" Christian . . . the one who most often signals his presence in the letters by one or another small clue, is a free artisan or small trader'. Overall, however, there was 'a mixture of social levels in each congregation', reflecting 'a fair cross-section of urban society'.[17]

[14] See e.g. Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 205–31.

[15] Edwin A. Judge, 'The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community', *JRH* 1 (1961): 4–15, 125–37.

[16] The pioneering study is Edwin A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960), repr. in Edwin A. Judge, *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century*, ed. David Scholer (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2008), 1–56. Note also Abraham J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), and Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), esp. 51–73, on 'The Social Level of Pauline Christians'.

[17] The phrasing cited all from Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 73.

Across the second and third centuries, there appears to have been an increasing, but still small, number of higher-status converts. In Justin Martyr we even have a Christian seeking to be taken seriously as a philosopher (but we cannot be confident whether he succeeded in this aim beyond Christian circles).[18] Granted, by the third century, Christian converts included some from upper echelons of Roman society. Nevertheless, the overall picture of the social makeup of Christian groups does not radically change from the first-century urban groups reflected in Paul's letters. This is broadly in line with Lampe's detailed analysis of evidence for Christians in Rome in the first few centuries.[19] Trebilco's study of early Christianity in Ephesus does not deal explicitly with social strata, but he does include a discussion of references to material possessions in the Christian texts that may reflect Ephesian Christianity, noting indications of some moderately wealthy believers among larger bodies of Christians generally of more modest means.[20] As far as levels of education and abilities in reading/writing in particular are concerned, we have indications of some Christians with what looks like a 'grammar school' education, but it is hard to find anyone from the elite cultural levels, such as Celsus, the second-century critic of Christianity (who progressed on through the highest level of the three levels of classical education).[21]

The main point, however, is that typical Christian circles of the first three centuries were socially mixed, with most adherents from lower social strata, a minority from middle levels, and a very few from upper levels. To be sure, studies by Judge, Malherbe, and others have forged a majority view different from early twentieth-century pictures of early Christianity as a movement wholly made up of the dispossessed.[22] We should recognize that earliest Christian circles comprised typically a variety of social levels, and that people with some property and level of education, from the first, seem often to have exercised particularly influential roles. But this very mixture of social levels immediately distinguishes Christian groups from the more homogeneous elite circles that formed the focus of Johnson's study. That is, the diversity of social levels typical of early Christian circles is what gives them a specific, perhaps

[18] See the multi-author volume from the recent conference on Justin held in the University of Edinburgh: Sara Parvis and Paul Foster, eds., *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007).

[19] Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003 [German edn. 1989]), esp. 138–50, 351–5.

[20] Paul Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 404–45, and esp. his conclusion to this chapter, 443–5.

[21] Rafaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind* (Princeton: PUP, 2001), esp. chs. 6–8 on the three levels of education. For Celsus, see Henry Chadwick, tr., *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: CUP, 1965); Jeffrey W. Hargis, *Against the Christians* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999).

[22] Malherbe, *Social Aspects*; and Edwin Judge's review of scholarship, 'The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History', *JRH* 11 (1980): 210–17, repr. in Judge, *Social Distinctives of Christians*, 117–35. I cite this reprint here.

distinctive, socio-cultural identity. Judge remarked that early Christianity 'broke through social barriers and encompassed people of every level of community life in a way that had never been the case with any movement of ideas of an organized kind'.[23]

Early Christian Manuscripts

With this very brief and general sketch of the typical social settings comprised in early Christian gatherings, let us now turn to the visual features typical of earliest Christian manuscripts for what they tell us about the readers and settings for which they were copied.[24] In what follows, I shall argue that earliest Christian manuscripts present us with a striking contrast to the sort of artefacts to which Johnson drew attention.[25] I propose that the format typical of early Christian manuscripts suggests that they were prepared for a certain spectrum of mainly non-elite reader-competence.

The first and most obvious feature to note about early Christian manuscripts is that the great majority of them are codices, reflecting a curious preference by early Christians for the codex over the bookroll for their literary texts. This preference is comparatively well known among scholars, but I am not confident that the full pattern of data has been engaged in some attempts to account for this preference. More specifically, the extant manuscript evidence suggests that early Christians generally preferred the codex for their literary texts, but especially for those literary texts that they most highly prized, those that functioned as scripture. Christians were somewhat more ready to use the bookroll for other texts, such as theological treatises, liturgical

[23] Judge, 'Social Identity', 134.

[24] In the following discussion, I draw heavily on my fuller discussion of all these matters in L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006). In other publications as well I have drawn attention to the physical and visual features discussed here, e.g. Larry W. Hurtado, 'Early Christian Manuscripts as Artifacts', in Craig A. Evans and Daniel Zacharias (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 66–80.

[25] In a recent stimulating essay, Scott D. Charlesworth discusses the physical/visual features of early Christian Gospels MSS with a view to determining whether a given copy was intended for liturgical/public or private reading: 'Public and Private: Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts', in Evans and Zacharias, *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, 148–75. His essay is rich in details and references, and his question and basic approach seem to me cogent. In particular, I agree that MSS with readers' aids provided by the original copyist likely were intended for ease of public/liturgical reading. But I question his claim that the various readers' aids he discusses are more common in 2nd-cent. Gospel MSS than in 3rd-cent. copies (148). Likewise, I hesitate over his insistence that the Christian copyist-conventions such as *nomina sacra* must indicate 'controlled settings' and early Christian copying centres (e.g. 149, 17–74). There may well have been some such settings, but the spread of these Christian copyist conventions does not seem to me to require these settings or necessarily reflect them.

texts, and other texts that may have functioned more for personal edification or study, although even in these genres the codex dominated.

It may be helpful to give some figures, which are derived from a recent consultation of the Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB).[26] Of forty-one Christian manuscripts dated to the second century in the LDAB catalogue, 24 per cent are rolls, 76 per cent codices; and of about 190 third-century Christian manuscripts 23 per cent are rolls, and 77 per cent codices. Moreover, although Christian items make up about 2 per cent of the total of second-century manuscripts, about 27 per cent of the total of second-century codices are identifiably Christian books. Christian items make up about 12 per cent of the total of third-century manuscripts, but 38 per cent of third-century codices.[27] Across the first four centuries, over 70 per cent of all codices are Christian manuscripts.

Although the general preference for the codex among early Christians is clear and striking, I contend that it is even more interesting that use of the codex is nearly total for copies of the texts that came to form the Christian canon. Among about seventy-five copies of OT texts dated to the second and third centuries, probably no more than 7 per cent of those that we may confidently take as Christian manuscripts are rolls. So far as NT writings are concerned, we do not have a single extant copy written on an unused roll (excluding, thus, the few examples of reused rolls, 'opisthographs', such as $\mathfrak{P}^{22}$). By contrast, of fifty-eight second/third-century copies of extra-canonical Christian texts, some 34 per cent are bookrolls. So, as noted already, there appears to have been a somewhat greater Christian readiness to retain the bookroll for these sorts of texts.

In light of the overwhelming general preference for the bookroll in the period considered here, especially for copies of literary texts, the Christian preference for the codex book-form suggests some further observations. The first of these is that this preference for the codex must have been conscious and deliberate. Early Christians cannot have been unconscious that their preferred book-form was out of step with the larger book culture of the time. Indeed, the evidence suggests a particularly deliberate effort to move away from the bookroll for copies of texts that were intended to function in their assemblies as scripture, as part of their ritual culture, as texts that were associated closely with their gathered worship settings.

[26] The LDAB is a valuable online database which as of the date of writing (Mar. 2010) has over 15,000 MSS logged: http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab.

[27] Roger Bagnall has recently questioned the 2nd-cent. dating of some Christian MSS, contending that many/most should be dated a bit later, to the 3rd cent.: *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: PUP, 2009). This would make little difference to my points here. Bagnall's discussion of the Christian preference for the codex seems to me beset with some problems, as I note in my review of his book in *Review of Biblical Literature*: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/7289_7933.pdf.

This is all the more likely when we recognize what was involved. Preparation of a codex required skills and judgements distinguishable from and additional to those required of copyists on bookrolls. For the latter, the basic steps were to acquire a sufficient length of writing material (sold in shops by length and quality), and then copy the text in neat columns. But using a codex requires, for example, the ability to estimate how many sheets will be needed, decisions about how to construct the codex (one gathering or multiple gatherings, and if the latter the number of sheets in each gathering), and use of a different layout (wider lines). So, the choice of whether to use a bookroll or a codex was certainly not a casual one. I suggest that it was unlikely also that professional copyists of literary texts, who would have been given to the use of the bookroll, were ready to use the one or the other book-form with equanimity.

A small constellation of other formatting features strengthens the suspicion that we are dealing with evidence of a specific reading-culture very different, even deliberately different, from the elite circles to which Johnson pointed.[28] The space available in this chapter requires me to present here only a brief overview of these matters.[29] Let us begin with noting the nature of the copyists' hands typical in Christian manuscripts. The hands are usually clear, competent, and readable, but not calligraphic in visual appearance.[30] The letters often include rounded forms and are less regular in size, but are carefully written separately and without ligatures. In a number of cases, the lettering is somewhat larger than characteristic of literary bookrolls, and the spacing between lines somewhat greater, resulting in fewer lines per column than in high-quality pagan literary manuscripts with comparable column-heights. Even in comparison with contemporary pagan codices containing literary texts, Christian codices of equivalent size tend to have fewer lines per page and fewer

[28] See now Alan Mugridge's analysis of the quality and nature of the copyist hands of over 500 Christian MSS of the first four centuries: 'Stages of Development in Scribal Professionalism in Early Christian Circles' (Ph.D. thesis, University of New England, 2010). He concludes that the overwhelming majority reflect skilled ('professional') copyists, but fewer exhibit a calligraphic hand.

[29] I summarize briefly here MS features discussed more fully in Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 155–89.

[30] Among NT MSS of this early period, the hand(s) of $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$/$\mathfrak{P}^{64}$/$\mathfrak{P}^{67}$, noticeably toward a calligraphic appearance, represents an exception (these three all possibly from the same codex). T. C. Skeat argued that these were remnants of a four-gospel codex: 'The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels', *NTS* 43 (1997): 1–34, repr. in J. K. Elliott (ed.), *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat* (NovTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 158–92. But see the criticism of Skeat's case by Peter M. Head, 'Is P4, P64 and P67 the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T. C. Skeat', *NTS* 51 (2005): 450–557. Recently, Don Barker has proposed that $\mathfrak{P}^{39}$, 0206, 0232, and $\mathfrak{P}^{88}$ may all be early 3rd-cent. or even late 2nd-cent. MSS, all of which he also describes as 'deluxe' editions with a calligraphic hand and careful bilinearity: 'How Long and Old is the Codex of which P.Oxy. 1353 is a Leaf?', in Evans and Zacharias, *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, 192–202.

letters per line, as noted by Eric Turner in his invaluable study of ancient codices.[31]

In addition, Christian codices, especially those containing scripture texts, exhibit punctuation marking sense-units and probably intended to signal where a reader should pause slightly (often a 'middle-stop', a dot placed vertically mid-way in a line). As examples, among earliest Christian manuscripts we find punctuation in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ (Gospel of Luke and John), and $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ (Gospel of John), both manuscripts dated *c.*200 AD. These and other early Christian manuscripts also show the use of slightly enlarged spaces in lines to mark sense-units (roughly corresponding to our sentences), which would similarly signal where to make a pause in reading the text.

One also finds the use of a 'diaeresis', a set of two dots resembling the German *umlaut*, written above the initial vowel of a word that follows immediately another word ending in a vowel. This mark signals to the reader that the vowel above which it is written is not part of a diphthong but the first letter of a new word. In some cases, the diaeresis may also signal a vowel to be aspirated (i.e. a 'rough-breathing'). We have an early example of the diaeresis in $\mathfrak{P}^{52}$ (the Rylands fragment of the Gospel of John), where it appears over the initial *iota* of *ιουδαιοι* (recto, line 1, John 18: 31) and also over the initial *iota* of *ινα* (recto, line 2, John 18: 32; verso, line 2), another manuscript which takes us back at least to the late second century.[32]

I emphasize that these features are typically provided by the copyist, and not added by readers. In terms from the world of the automobile, they are not owner customizations but 'factory equipment'. Collectively, they amount to a conspicuous effort to produce copies of texts with an emphasis on legibility, ease of reading, and even built-in guidance on how the text should be read. That is, the Christian manuscripts with these features reflect an effort to place somewhat less of a burden on the reader to decide how to deliver the text orally.[33]

I submit further that this constitutes a very different purpose in comparison to the manuscripts studied by Johnson. In the Christian manuscripts, we have a greater concern for the content, the text itself, and what looks like comparatively

[31] Eric G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), esp. 85–7. In Turner's list of twenty-three codices from the 2nd/3rd cents. with 50 or more lines per page (which he judged to be the upper end of the spectrum of lines per page), P. Chester Beatty IX–X (a copy of Daniel, Esther, *et al.*) is the only Christian codex (which has 45–57 lines per page).

[32] In light of the later dating of the 'Egerton Gospel' (P.Lond.Christ. 1 + P.Koln 6.255) towards the late 2nd cent., which formed the basis for Roberts's dating of P52, the latter might well also have to be dated later than previously assumed. Cf. C. H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: MUP, 1935), and the recent critique by B. Nongbri, 'The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel', *HTR* 98 (2005): 23–48.

[33] A similar proposal was offered by Turner, *Typology of the Early Codex*, 85–6.

less concern to produce a copy with strong aesthetic qualities. Unlike the manuscripts prepared for elite pagan circles, copies that are as much the product of high craftsmanship, almost *objets d'art*, the Christian manuscripts to which I refer seem to have been prepared to serve fully and simply the texts that they contain, and those who will read them.

But it would be simplistic to conclude that early Christian manuscripts are merely utilitarian. If Johnson is correct that the format of the pagan literary rolls was intended to reflect and affirm the exclusivity of the elite social circles in which they were to be read, then Christian manuscripts (especially those that appear to have been prepared for public reading) typically seem to reflect a very different social setting, perhaps deliberately so. I propose that they reflect a concern to make the texts accessible to a wider range of reader-competence, with fewer demands made on readers to engage and deliver them. In turn, this probably reflects the more socially diverse and inclusive nature of typical early Christian groups. That is, I submit that these early Christian manuscripts are direct evidence and confirmation of the greater social breadth and diversity represented in early Christian circles, in comparison to the elite social circles in which pagan literary texts were more typically read.

Can we go further and surmise that these manuscripts evidence a *conscious turn away* from the elitist format of high-quality literary manuscripts? If so, then the formatting of earliest Christian literary codices would represent the artefacts of a deliberate effort to reflect, affirm, and facilitate a distinguishable Christian book/text culture, one characterized by social inclusiveness and diversity. If high-quality pagan bookrolls were intended to be daunting to anyone but the elite, these Christian manuscripts appear to be intended to enable a greater range of Christians to serve in the public reading of texts in Christian gatherings.

Indeed, we could also say that the social effects of this (and perhaps one of the intentions) included 'enfranchising' a wider social diversity of people in Christian circles in the public reading and discussion of literary texts, activities that were otherwise dominantly associated with elite social strata. The prominent place of the public reading and discussion of literary texts (especially scriptures) in churches meant that these experiences (which, again, were more associated with cultured elite social strata) were extended to a wider diversity of people, including many for whom these sorts of experiences would otherwise not be likely. That is, early Christian manuscripts are probably also artefacts of this very interesting further social consequence of the centrality of the reading of literary texts in Christian gatherings.

Also, there are noteworthy instances of what we may think of as Christian watermarks, or at least visual references to Christian faith. Indeed, I have referred to these as comprising the earliest extant evidence of an emerging

'visual culture' in ancient Christianity.[34] I refer specifically to the *nomina sacra*, and the 'staurogram'. I have discussed these phenomena rather fully elsewhere, and so here I shall simply present a summary of relevant matters.[35]

The so-called *nomina sacra* have been noted often, and in recent years have been the object of renewed interest.[36] Although some scholars have proposed that they originated simply as readers' aids, intended to provide navigation points on the page, the majority view is that these curious abbreviations of key words in early Christian discourse were visual expressions of Christian piety.[37] Moreover, they are distinctively Christian. Neither the specific words themselves (the earliest and most consistently treated are *Θεος*, *Κυριος*, *Ιησους*, and *Χριστος*) nor the forms in which they are written have a direct analogy or precedent beyond early Christian manuscripts. So widely is their distinctiveness recognized among experts in ancient manuscripts that the presence of any one of them on an otherwise unidentifiable fragment is typically sufficient for a palaeographer to judge it likely part of some Christian manuscript.

Although there is a certain similarity in the reverential attitude behind the ways that the Tetragrammaton was treated in ancient Jewish manuscripts (e.g. written in a distinctive script, or replaced with a series of dots, or sometimes with *Elohim*), there are also crucial differences. Allowing for their variations, the *nomina sacra* are much more standardized. They are abbreviated forms of the words in question, with a horizontal stroke placed over the abbreviation. Moreover, it appears that the Jewish special treatment given to the Tetragrammaton was intended particularly to signal to readers not to pronounce *YHWH* but to use a reverential substitute, such as *Adonay* in Hebrew or *Kyrios* in Greek. But there is no indication that in the public reading of early Christian texts reverential substitutes were used for the words represented by the *nomina sacra*. Instead, it appears that the lector pronounced the words normally, the abbreviated forms making no difference.[38] That is, the *nomina sacra* seem to have been purely a *visual* phenomenon, a written/visual expression of reverence for the referents of the words in question. Readers of

[34] L. W. Hurtado, 'The Earliest Evidence of an Emerging Christian Material and Visual Culture: The Codex, the *Nomina Sacra* and the Staurogram', in S. G. Wilson and M. Desjardins, eds., *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000), 271–88.

[35] Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts,* 95–134 (the *nomina sacra*), 135–54 (the 'staurogram').

[36] C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Christian Egypt* (London: OUP, 1979), 26–48, was the stimulus for renewed interest in the *nomina sacra*. My own article later drew further attention to the matter: L. W. Hurtado, 'The Origin of the Nomina Sacra: A Proposal', *JBL* 117 (1998): 655–73.

[37] Cf. e.g. C. M. Tuckett, ' "Nomina Sacra": Yes and No?', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, eds., *The Biblical Canons* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 431–58; and my discussion of the significance of the devices in Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts,* 120–33.

[38] Granted, this is an argument from silence, as I am not aware of any reference to the way that Christian lectors handled the *nomina sacra*.

Christian texts would encounter and have to deal with them, but auditors would not.[39]

The so-called 'staurogram' is a device that likewise seems to have been deployed in early Christian manuscripts as an expression of Christian faith.[40] The device involves the superimposing of the majuscule letter *rho* on the majuscule *tau*. The bare device itself can be traced in various non/pre-Christian utilitarian uses (e.g. as a symbol for '3' or '30'), but it was adopted in some early Christian manuscripts and deployed in a uniquely Christian manner and with a distinctively Christian meaning. Specifically, the earliest Christian uses of the device are as part of the way that the words *σταυρος* ('cross') and *σταυροω* ('crucify') are written in some early manuscripts containing NT texts. In these cases, the words are abbreviated, that is, treated as *nomina sacra* (so with a horizontal line over the abbreviated form), the abbreviation including the first and final letter(s), and including also the *tau* and the *rho* of these words combined to form the 'staurogram' device. That the earliest extant Christian use of the device is in these manuscripts and *solely* as part of the words 'cross' and 'crucify' has led a number of scholars to judge that the Christian purpose was to allude visually to the crucified Jesus, the loop of the *rho* intended as a pictographic reference to the head of a crucified figure on a cross (represented by the *tau*).[41] If this is correct (and I think it is), these instances of the 'staurogram' comprise our earliest visual references to the crucified Jesus, earlier by some 150 years than what are usually taken by historians of Christian art as the initial examples.[42]

In any case, the *nomina sacra* and the staurogram represent efforts to mark early Christian manuscripts visually as Christian. These scribal devices were not utilitarian in purpose. The *nomina sacra* were not intended really as abbreviations in the ordinary sense of that word; they did not function to

[39] But given the high regard for scripture texts in many early Christian circles, is it wildly imaginative to suppose that ordinary believers, even illiterate ones, might have asked to view the copy of a sacred text, out of admiration and reverence?

[40] In addition to my discussion in *The Earliest Christian Artifacts,* 135–54, see also my essay, 'The Staurogram in Early Christian Manuscripts: The Earliest Visual Reference to the Crucified Jesus?' in Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, eds., *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Text and Their World* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 207–26.

[41] e.g. Kurt Aland, 'Bemerkungen zum Alter und Entstehung des Christogramms anhand von Beobachtungen bei 𝔓[66] und 𝔓[75]', *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967), 173–9; Erika Dinkler-von Schubert, '*ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ*: Vom "Wort vom Kreuz" (1 Kor. 1,18) zum Kreuz-Symbol', in Doula Mouriki *et al*., eds., *Byzantine East, Latin West: Art-Historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann* (Princeton: Dept of Art and Archaeology, 1995), 29–39.

[42] Two Christian gems dated to the 4th cent. and a 5th-cent. seal in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City are frequently cited as earliest visual depictions of the crucified Jesus. But cf. now Robin Margaret Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art* (London: Routledge, 2000), 131–41, who has recognized the 'staurogram' as likely an earlier pictographic reference to the crucified figure of Jesus.

save space. Nor did they have some pedestrian function, such as orientation points for readers on a codex page.[43] They originated and developed as visual expressions of Christian piety, especially in the case of the four earliest words so treated, which have been referred to more specifically as *nomina divina*.[44] The earliest Christian use of the *tau-rho* device, the 'staurogram', is even more obviously a visual expression of Christian devotion. Earliest Christian manuscripts are not often calligraphic or luxurious, and as we have noted reflect an impressively conscious turn from the literary bookroll toward the codex, which in the general culture of the time was regarded as less elegant or appropriate for literary texts. But the *nomina sacra* and the staurogram in particular show a concern for imprinting a distinctive semiotic quality on early Christian manuscripts, identifying them specifically as Christian items.

CONCLUSION

Freely acknowledging the limited dimensions of the preceding discussion, nevertheless, I hope to have shown that earliest Christian manuscripts hold a significance well beyond the technical interests of palaeographers and papyrologists, that these ancient items are artefacts of historically noteworthy social developments comprised by earliest Christian circles. In particular, I contend that these manuscripts reflect and promoted a specifically Christian reading-culture that in its historical setting was innovative and remarkable. It comprised a social phenomenon very different from the elite reading culture studied by Johnson, and involved the enfranchising and affirmation of a diversity of social strata in the public reading and discussion of literary texts, specifically texts that formed the charter documents of their religious life.

[43] *Contra* Tuckett, ' "Nomina Sacra": Yes and No?'
[44] Schuyler Brown, 'Concerning the Origin of the Nomina Sacra', *SPap* 9 (1970): 7–19.

4

Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts

Michael J. Kruger

As scholars explore the state of the earliest New Testament text and attempt to assess its stability or fluidity, the natural place to begin is with an inductive study of the earliest textual remnants we possess, whether in the papyri or in citations from the early church fathers. Such studies have not been infrequent over the years and the remaining sections of this current volume are devoted to offering another contribution in precisely these areas (see Parts II and III below).[1] However, as vital as these studies are, there are also other lines of potentially fruitful inquiry. One area that has been largely overlooked is the attitude toward that text that is actually *expressed* by Christians in the earliest literary sources, that is, statements about how they would have viewed their sacred writings, how they would have understood the transmission and preservation of these texts, and how they would have responded to changes or alterations in the text. In other words, while much attention has been given to the literary *products* of early Christians (the text itself), less has been given

[1] Some examples include W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions of the Second Century* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1989); C. B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott, eds., *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003); B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993); Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, ed., *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905); H. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostlischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957); A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967); H. Koester, 'Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?', *JBL* 113 (1994): 293–7; A. Gregory and C. Tuckett, eds., *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: OUP, 2005); for other examples of attempts to extract texts from the fathers, see the Society of Biblical Literature series ed. M. W. Holmes, *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers, Texts and Analyses*, (1986–present).

to the literary *culture* of early Christians (their expressed attitude to the text). It is important that we consider such historical testimony not only because it often antedates the papyri and even many patristic citations, but because it establishes a critical historical context for our overall understanding of textual transmission in the earliest stages of Christianity.

Of course, this is not to suggest that the papyri (or patristic citations[2]) do not themselves contribute to our understanding of early Christian attitudes toward textual reproduction. No doubt much can be learned about such attitudes by simply observing the well-known textual 'fluidity' that is present at various points within our earliest sources. Whether it is the harmonizing tendency of scribes,[3] theologically motivated alterations,[4] the addition of larger pericopes (e.g. the long ending of Mark and the *pericope adulterae*),[5] or the existence of specific 'free' texts (e.g. $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$),[6] it is clear that early Christians, at points, were quite willing to change the text in front of them.[7] However, the concern of this chapter is simply that there are additional (and largely overlooked) sources beyond the papyri that can also contribute to our understanding of early Christian attitudes toward textual reproduction. If we are to have a full-orbed view of how Christian texts were reproduced in these earliest centuries, then *both* kinds of evidence—papyri/patristic citations and express attitudes toward textual transmission—ought to be considered.

Unfortunately, when the express statements of early Christians are not considered, then variations in the papyri (or patristic citations) become the

[2] It is difficult to know how much patristic citations should determine the state of the text in the early centuries given the challenges in determining whether the author is citing from memory, paraphrasing, conflating, or intending to offer an exact quote. See G. D. Fee, 'The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations', *Bib* 52 (1971): 357–73; G. D. Fee, 'The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in Ehrman and Holmes, *Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 191–207; M. J. Suggs, 'The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text', *NTS* 4 (1957): 139–47; B. D. Ehrman, 'The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism', in B. Aland and J. Delobel, eds., *New Testament Text Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 118–35.

[3] See helpful discussions in G. D. Fee, 'Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem', in B. Orchard and T.R.W. Longstaff, eds., *J. J. Griesbach* (Cambridge: CUP, 1978), 154–69; and G. D. Fee, 'A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem', *NovT* 22 (1980): 12–28.

[4] B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York: OUP, 1993); Kirsopp Lake, *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament* (Oxford: Parker & Son, 1904); J. R. Harris, 'New Points of View in Textual Criticism', *ExpTim* 7 (1914): 316–34; E. J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge: CUP, 1966).

[5] Examples of recent works on these topics include B. R. Gaventa and P. D. Miller, eds., *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2005); and C. Keith, *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2009).

[6] K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 93.

[7] Parker refers to the fluidity of the early text in the title of his book, D. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997).

only basis for evaluating early Christian attitudes toward the text. For example, Lee McDonald declares,

> Many mistakes in the manuscripts were made and subsequently transmitted in the churches. This suggests that these documents were not generally recognized as Scripture until the end of the second century C.E. Scribal attempts at improvements in the text occurred regularly, and apparently no attempts were made to stop this activity until the fourth century, when more stability in the text of the NT began to take place.[8]

Notice here that McDonald uses the evidence from the papyri to make broad declarations about the way Christians viewed their texts in these early stages (not as scripture), and the way they viewed the reproduction of these texts (no one cared to stop changes). Helmut Koester follows the same pattern in regard to patristic citations of the New Testament. He argues that harmonized quotes from the Gospels in the second-century church fathers 'demonstrate that their text was not sacrosanct and that alterations could be expected'.[9] Notice again that Koester uses evidence from these patristic citations to draw broader conclusions about how Christians must have approached their texts (not as scripture) and how they would have viewed changes to the text (they would have expected them). Indeed, it is precisely these conclusions about early Christian attitudes toward their texts that fuels Koester's conviction that the earliest *unobservable* stages of transmission were 'very unstable' and full of 'serious corruption'.[10]

The limitation, of course, with this sort of approach is that there are other historical sources from this same time period (and some even earlier) that suggest this is not necessarily how early Christians viewed these texts or how they approached their transmission. Thus, it is the intent of this chapter to make an initial, albeit limited, assessment of some of these historical sources.

[8] L. M. McDonald, *The Biblical Canon* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 359. A similar argument is made by G. M. Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 96; D. W. Riddle, 'Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline', *ATR* 18 (1936): 227; and Parker, *The Living Text*, 202–5.

[9] H. Koester, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in Petersen, *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, 37. In addition, Koester appeals to the use of Mark by Matthew and Luke as further evidence that these books were not seen as scripture and that people felt free to change them (20–1). However, there is a categorical difference between the way a book is *constructed* by its author (who may choose to use a variety of sources) and the way a finished book is subsequently *transmitted* by someone who is not the author. Simply because an author uses sources in his original composition does not imply that later alterations would have been generally viewed as an acceptable practice. Since this chapter (and this volume) is devoted primarily to the issue of transmission, issues related to composition will not be dealt with here. For more on Matthew and Luke's use of Mark see F. Wisse, 'The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels', in Petersen, *Gospel Traditions of the Second Century*, 42–3.

[10] Koester, 'Text of the Synoptic Gospels', 37, 19.

Our study will focus on the critical time before 200 AD and will be divided into two sections that will address each of the issues raised by McDonald and Koester: (i) we will examine the degree to which early Christians viewed the New Testament text as having scriptural status; and (ii) we will examine early testimony that directly pertains to how Christians viewed the reproduction of the New Testament text.

EARLY TESTIMONY REGARDING THE SCRIPTURAL STATUS OF NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS

By the time of Irenaeus at the end of the second century, all four gospels and Paul's core epistles (as well as some catholic epistles) seem to have a clear scriptural status, especially when we consider the Muratorian fragment from roughly the same time period.[11] But is there additional evidence prior to this time period? Needless to say this complex question demands more attention than we can give it here, but we can survey a few select examples.

2 Peter 3: 16

One of the earliest examples comes from the well-known passage in 2 Peter 3: 16 where Paul's letters are regarded as on par with the τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς of the Old Testament. Most notably, this passage does not refer to just one letter of Paul, but to a *collection* of Paul's letters (how many is unclear) that had already begun to circulate throughout the churches—so much so that the author could refer to 'all his [Paul's] letters' and expect that his audience would understand that to which he was referring.[12] Indeed, the author presents Paul's letters as scripture with no indication that this is an innovation or that his audience may not agree; he mentions it quite casually, offering no introduction, defense, or explanation of this idea. On the basis of this text, David

[11] For an overview of Irenaeus and Justin Martyr and the use of scripture, see G. N. Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 92–109. The date of the Muratorian fragment has recently been disputed by Hahneman, *Muratorian Fragment*. See response from Charles E. Hill, 'The Debate over the Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon', *WTJ* 57 (1995): 437–52; Everett Ferguson, 'Review of Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*', *JTS* 44 (1993): 691–7; and J. Verheyden, 'The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, eds., *The Biblical Canons* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 2003), 487–556.

[12] Regarding Pauline letter collections see David Trobisch, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989); and S. E. Porter, 'When and How was the Pauline Canon Compiled? An Assessment of Theories', in S. E. Porter, ed., *The Pauline Canon* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004), 95–127.

Meade concludes that 2 Peter 'clearly articulates a doctrine of "other," that is, Christian, scripture, which represents a significant milestone in Christian thought'.[13] Meade even argues that the author of 2 Peter includes Petrine texts within this category of Christian scripture by referring to Paul as '*our* (ἡμῶν) beloved brother' (3: 15), a likely reference to the 'college' of apostles in which Peter certainly participates (cf. 2 Pet. 1: 16).[14]

The epistle of 2 Peter is generally dated to the early second century (*c*.100–25),[15] and some scholars have suggested an earlier time of 80–90 CE.[16] The fact that such a collection of Pauline letters (and maybe other letters and books) would be considered scripture by the turn of the century should not be too surprising given the way Paul expected his letters to be received. Not only do Pauline letters regularly make claims that they have been written with divinely given authority (Gal. 1: 1; 1 Thess. 2: 13; 1 Cor. 7: 12, 14: 37), but they also include commands that they be read publicly at the gathering of the church (Col. 4: 16; 1 Thess. 5: 27; 2 Cor. 10: 9). This practice of reading scripture in worship can be traced back to the Jewish synagogue where portions from the Old Testament were routinely read aloud to the congregation (Luke 4: 17–20; Acts 13: 15, 15: 21).[17] Indeed, 1 Timothy makes this connection clear when Timothy is exhorted to 'devote yourself to the public reading of *Scripture*' (1 Tim. 4: 13).

1 Timothy 5: 18

Another noteworthy witness is 1 Tim. 5: 18, *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, Βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις, καί, Ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ*. The first citation seems to be derived from Deuteronomy 25: 4, and the second is identical in wording to Luke 10: 7 where it is found on the lips of Jesus. Although this text raises the possibility that 1 Timothy might be citing Luke's Gospel as scripture, this

[13] D. Meade, 'Ancient Near Eastern Apocalypticism and the Origins of the New Testament Canon of Scripture', in R. Heskett and B. Irwin, eds., *The Bible as a Human Witness* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 318.

[14] Ibid.

[15] J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 237; C. E. B. Cranfield, *I and II Peter and Jude: Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM, 1960), 149; J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1907), p. cxxvii; D. J. Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2003), 237. Some have tried to push the epistle's date as late as the middle of the 2nd cent.(e.g. McDonald, *Formation*, 277), but this position is decidedly in the minority and there seems to be little evidence to justify it.

[16] e.g. R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (Waco, Tex.: Word, 1983); and B. Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude* (New York: Doubleday, 1964).

[17] Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 209–11; H. Gamble, 'Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping of the New Testament Canon', in C. Horton, ed., *The Earliest Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 27–39.

understanding of the passage has been resisted by some. However, there are a number of reasons why we might want to keep this possibility open. (i) Suggestions that this text is merely alluding to oral tradition of Jesus does not fit with the fact that it is placed alongside an Old Testament citation and both are referred to as *ἡ γραφη*.[18] Marshall notes, 'A *written* source is surely required, and one that would have been authoritative.'[19] Thus, regardless of which book 1 Timothy is citing, it is clear that it considered *some* book to be scripture alongside the Old Testament. That fact alone should reshape our understanding of when Christians began to consider their own books 'scripture'. Indeed, Meade considers it evidence of an early 'canon consciousness'.[20] (ii) That 1 Timothy is using some other written source besides Luke (such as Q[21] or an apocryphal gospel[22]) is certainly possible, but seems unnecessary when Luke 10: 7 provides such a clear and obvious source for this citation. Not only is the Greek identical in these two texts, but it is *only* in these two texts that this passage occurs in this form.[23] Although it is true that we can never be certain about the use of Luke, it seems reasonable to prefer known historical sources over hypothetical and conjectural ones.[24] (iii) The idea that a Pauline book would cite Luke is also more plausible when one considers the way other

[18] That Paul is using oral tradition here is suggested by Lorenz Oberlinner, *Kommentar zum ersten Timotheusbrief* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1994), 254. Some have attempted to argue that the introductory phrase *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφη* refers only to the first citation and not the second: e.g. J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1960), 126; Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 79. However, the manner in which the citations follow right after one another and are joined with the simple *και* suggests that 'scripture' applies to both. Indeed, other New Testament examples of double citations—Matt. 15: 4; Mark 7: 10; Acts 1: 20; 1 Pet. 2: 6; 2 Pet. 2: 22—have both citations included in the introductory formula (George W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 234). Thus, I. Howard Marshall, declares, 'Both quotations are envisaged as coming from "Scripture"' (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 615).

[19] Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 616; emphasis mine.

[20] Meade, 'Ancient Near Eastern Apocalypticism', 316.

[21] A. T. Hanson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 102.

[22] Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, 126; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 79.

[23] The similar phrase in Matt. 10: 10 is still different from Luke 10: 7 and 1 Tim. 5: 18. Echoes of this phrase also occur in 1 Cor. 9: 14 and *Didache* 13.2. For more, see A. E. Harvey, '"The Workman is Worthy of his Hire": Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church', *NovT* 24 (1982): 209–21.

[24] W. L. Petersen, 'Textual Traditions Examined: What the Text of the Apostolic Fathers Tells us about the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century', in A. Gregory and C. Tuckett, eds.,*The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 29–46, argues that even if we have an *exact* match between the apostolic fathers and a New Testament writing we still cannot be sure that the New Testament writing is really being cited because the text of these books was in flux. How do we know that Luke in the 2nd cent. was the 'Luke' we have now in our NA^{27} text? Petersen's point is a fair one; he is right that we cannot be absolutely sure. However, historical study is never about what is absolutely certain, but it is about what is most probable or reasonable.

historical sources link the two together. Luke is not only presented as a frequent travelling companion of Paul's throughout the book of Acts, but his name is mentioned a number of times in other Pauline letters (Col. 4: 14; 2 Tim. 4: 11; Philemon 1: 24). Moreover, there is a regular connection between Paul and Luke's Gospel in the writings of the early church fathers.[25] Some have even suggested that Luke was Paul's amanuensis for 1 Timothy.[26] Such a strong historical connection between these two individuals makes it more plausible that a Pauline letter would cite from Luke's Gospel.

The book of 1 Timothy is typically dated at the end of the first century, from 90–100 AD.[27] Such a timeframe would show that at least some considered Luke's Gospel scripture alongside the Old Testament by the turn of the century—consistent with the general timeframe of 2 Peter 3: 16 above. As John Meier notes, 'The only interpretation that avoids contorted intellectual acrobatics or special pleading is the plain, obvious one. [1 Timothy] is citing Luke's Gospel alongside Deuteronomy as normative Scripture for the ordering of the church's ministry.'[28]

The Epistle of Barnabas

The *Epistle of Barnabas*, a theological treatise written in the early second century (c.130 CE), proved to be quite popular with early Christians. At one point it declares, *ὡς γέγραπται πολλοὶ κλητοί ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὑρεθῶμεν.*[29] This citation finds its only parallel in Matthew 22: 14 and in nearly identical Greek, leading Köhler and Carleton Paget to suggest Matthew is the most likely source.[30] Although some have suggested *Barnabas* is pulling from oral tradition, this option does not fully account for the word *γέγραπται* ('it is written'). While the possibility that Barnabas is drawing upon another written

[25] e.g. Irenaeus (*H.E.* 5.8.3); Origen (*H.E.* 6.25.6); and the Muratorian Fragment.

[26] C. F. D. Moule, 'The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal', *BJRL* 47 (1965): 430–52.

[27] Hanson, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 13; W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1973), 387; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 58; Meier, 'The Inspiration of Scripture', 78. Campenhausen's well-known claim that the pastoral epistles derive from the time of Polycarp (*The Formation of the Christian Bible* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972), 181) has not been widely accepted and places the letters too late to be so readily received by Irenaeus and the Muratorian fragment just a short time later; see critique of Campenhausen in L. T. Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 84–5; and Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament,* 386–7.

[28] John P. Meier, 'The Inspiration of Scripture: But What Counts as Scripture?', *Mid-Stream,* 38 (1999): 77.

[29] *Barn.* 4.14.

[30] W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987), 113; J. Carleton Paget, 'The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Gregory and Tuckett, *Reception of the New Testament*, 232–3.

gospel source certainly cannot be ruled out, there is again no need, methodologically speaking, to insist on hypothetical sources when a known source can adequately account for the data. Carleton Paget comments:

> But in spite of all these arguments, it still remains the case that the closest existing text to *Barn* 4.14 in all known literature is Matt 22.14, and one senses that attempts to argue for independence from Matthew are partly motivated by a desire to avoid the implications of the *formula citandi* ["it is written"] which introduces the relevant words: namely, that the author of *Barnabas* regarded Matthew as scriptural.[31]

Polycarp

Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, wrote his epistle to the church at Philippi around 110. In this letter he declares, "As it is written in these Scriptures, 'Be angry and do not sin and do not let the sun go down on your anger.' "[32] The first part of this quote could come from Psalm 4: 5, but the two parts together appear to come from Ephesians 4: 26. While Metzger suggests that "[Polycarp] calls Ephesians 'Scripture,' "[33] others have offered alternative explanations.[34] In particular, Koester suggests that Polycarp simply made a mistake here and thought (erroneously) that the entire phrase in Ephesians 4: 26 came from Psalm 4: 5.[35] Thus, argues Koester, Polycarp only meant to use the term "scripture" to refer to the Old Testament portion. Although this is possible, there is no evidence within the text that Polycarp had made such a mistake. On the contrary, Polycarp's knowledge of Paul's writing is well established and he has demonstrated a "very good memory" regarding Pauline citations.[36] Consequently, Dehandschutter considers such a mistake by Polycarp to be "very unlikely" and argues that Polycarp is clearly referring to the book of Ephesians as "scripture".[37] Even McDonald agrees that Polycarp calls both Psalms and Ephesians "scripture".[38]

[31] J. Carleton Paget, 'The *Epistle of Barnabas*', 233.

[32] Pol. *Phil* 12.1. Latin text: *Modo, ut his scripturis dictum est, irascimini et nolite peccare, et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram.*

[33] B. M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 62.

[34] For a survey of the different options see, Kenneth Berding, *Polycarp and Paul* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002), 204 ff.; and Paul Hartog, 'Polycarp, Ephesians, and "Scripture" ', *WTJ* 70 (2008): 255–75.

[35] Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 113.

[36] Berding, *Polycarp and Paul*, 118.

[37] B. Dehandschutter, 'Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: An Early Example of "Reception" ', in J.-M. Sevrin, ed., *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1989), 282.

[38] McDonald, *Biblical Canon*, 276.

Of course, this all too brief survey of only a few selected sources is by no means definitive. After all, second-century Christianity was no monolithic affair and was marked by a rich diversity of theological viewpoints (and texts to promote them).[39] Thus, it is difficult to know how representative the above sources are for Christianity as a whole. Nonetheless, they are at least suggestive that by the early second century some New Testament books (though we do not know how many) were not only functioning like scripture but were regarded as scripture by early Christians. This seems to find confirmation in a number of recent studies—by Stanton, Heckel, Kelhoffer, and others—that have argued the fourfold gospel was established by the early or middle second century.[40] Likewise, John Barton has argued in an insightful study that the core books of the New Testament, mainly the Gospels and core epistles, were the authoritative source for Christians "astonishingly early".[41] He concludes that it would be "mistaken to say that [by the early second century] 'there was no Christian Scripture other than the Old Testament' for much of the core already had as high a status as it would ever have".[42] And there are other pre-200 sources that we could consider—additional allusions/citations in the apostolic fathers[43] and Justin Martyr and his "memoirs of the apostles"[44]—but we are not able to explore them further here.

EARLY TESTIMONY REGARDING THE REPRODUCTION OF NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS

As noted above, some scholars, on the basis of variations in the papyri/patristic citations, have not only argued that no New Testament books were viewed with scriptural authority (before *c*.200), but have argued that early Christians were consequently unconcerned about changes and alterations to

[39] J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1990).

[40] G. Stanton, 'The Fourfold Gospel', *NTS* 43 (1997): 317–46 (*c*.150); T. K. Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1999) (*c*.110–20); J. A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) (early 2nd cent.). Similar views are held by C. B. Amphoux, 'La Finale longue de Marc: Un épilogue des quatre évangiles', in C. Focant, ed., *The Synoptic Gospels* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1993), 548–55 (early 2nd cent.); David Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 2000); M. Hengel; *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000); and most recently, C. E. Hill, *Who Chose the Gospels?* (Oxford: OUP, 2010).

[41] Barton, *The Spirit and the Letter*, 18.

[42] Ibid. 19.

[43] *Didache* 8.2; Ign. *Eph.* 12.2, *Magn.* 13.1, Ign. *Trall.* 7.1; *Barn.* 4.14.

[44] For a helpful overview of the issues related to the use of the gospels (and other writings) in Justin Martyr, see Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel*, 92–109; and S. Parvis and P. Foster, eds., *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 53–112.

the New Testament text. But, again, we must not overlook other types of historical testimony, outside of the papyri/patristic citations, which speak to early Christian attitudes toward changes in the text. Due to space limitations, our survey of such testimony must be brief.

Neither Adding or Taking Away

If early Christians viewed their sacred books as scripture alongside the Old Testament, then we would expect attitudes of reproduction in the Old Testament to be paradigmatic for them. Most noteworthy in this regard is Deuteronomy 4: 2 (LXX), 'You shall not add (προσθήσετε) to the word that I command you, nor take from it (ἀφελεῖτε), that you may keep the - commandments of the LORD.'[45] This well-known passage functioned as an 'inscriptional curse'—which was common in extrabiblical ANE treaty-covenants[46]—designed to keep the covenant documents from being altered or changed in their transmission.[47] Not only is it repeated in Deuteronomy 12: 32 but it is echoed again in Proverbs 30: 5–6, 'Every word of God proves true . . . Do not add to his words, lest he rebuke you and you be found a liar.' Josephus confirms that this Old Testament principle (not always including the formal curse portion) continued to be recognized in the first century, 'We have given practical proof of our reverence for our own Scriptures. For, although such long ages have now passed, no one has ventured either to add or to remove, or to alter a syllable.'[48] Whether or not Josephus' assessment of the state of the text was accurate (and no doubt it was overly optimistic[49]), it is his *attitude* toward the text that is noteworthy here.

[45] See discussion in Gerhard Von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966), 48–9; and Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 129–30.

[46] M. G. Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 1997), 29–34; F. C. Fensham, 'Common Trends in Curses of the Near Eastern Treaties and Kudurru-Inscriptions Compared with Maledictions of Amos and Isaiah', *ZAW* 75 (1963): 155–75; Stanley Gevirtz, 'West-Semitic Curses and the Problem of the Origins of Hebrew Law', *VT* 11 (1961): 137–58; H. G. Güterbock, 'Mursili's Accounts of Suppiluliuma's Dealings with Egypt' *RHA* 18 (1960): 59–60; Michael A. Fishbane, 'Varia Deuteronomica', *ZAW* 84 (1972): 349–352; Pritchard, *ANET*, 161.

[47] The influence of inscriptional curses is notable in other Jewish literature; e.g. *Aristeas* 310–11; 1 Enoch 104: 9–10; 1 Macc. 8: 30; Josephus, *Ag. Ap*. 1.42; 11QTemple 54:5–7; *b. Meg.* 14a. David E. Aune, *Revelation 17–22* (Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1998), refers to this type of language as an 'integrity formula', 1208–16. This formula also occurs regularly among Greco-Roman writers who use it to bolster confidence in the accuracy of their accounts; e.g. Artemidorus (*Oneir* 2.70), Aristides (*Or*. 30.20), Chariton (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* 3.1.5), Cicero (*De oratore* 3.8.29), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom*. 5.8), and Lucian (*Hist*. 47).

[48] Josephus, *Ag. Ap*. 1.42.

[49] See discussion in Armin Lange, '"Nobody Dared to Add to Them, to Take from Them, or to Make Changes" (Josephus, *AG. AP*. 1.42): The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scripture in

This overall attitude toward the reproduction of Old Testament scriptures—particularly the language of 'not adding or taking away'—is not abandoned when we reach the New Testament era but is reaffirmed and applied (implicitly or explicitly) by early Christians to the New Testament writings.[50] Again a few select examples will have to suffice.

Galatians (c.55 AD)

As Paul rehearses the pattern of Old Testament covenant-making in the book of Galatians he reminds his readers of the general principle (echoing Deut. 4: 2) that when it comes to covenants, 'no one annuls it or adds to it once it has been ratified' (3: 15).[51] Therefore, for Paul—and no doubt for early Christians influenced by Paul or who shared Paul's Jewish background—covenant documents were not to be altered.[52]

Revelation (c.90–95)

Perhaps the most obvious allusion to Deuteronomy 4: 2 is the well-known passage in Revelation 22: 18–19, 'I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: if anyone adds (*ἐπιθῇ*) to them, God shall add to him the plagues which are written in this book; and if anyone takes away (*ἀφέλῃ*) from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life and from the holy city, which are written in this book.' Here we have a clear reinstitution of the inscriptional curse, but now applied to a book of the New Testament.[53] Aune observes, 'John's use of the integrity

Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in A. Hilhorst *et al.*, *Flores Florentino* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007), 105–26.

[50] For fuller discussion, see W. C. van Unnik, 'De la régle *μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν* dans l'histoire du canon', *VC* 3 (1949): 1–36.

[51] For discussion of the term *διαθήκη-γῤ′* here in Gal. 3: 15 see, R. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Dallas, Tex.: Word, 1990), 126–30. Broader discussion of the term in early Christianity can be found in W. C. van Unnik, '*ἡ καινὴ Διαθήκη-γῤ′* A Problem in the Early History of the Canon', *StPatr* 4 (1961): 212–27.

[52] In 2 Cor. 3: 14 Paul calls the written Torah the 'old covenant' (*τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης*), showing that he understands covenants to be *written* texts. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: A&C Black, 1973), 121, argues that in this passage 'old covenant' and 'Old Testament' are virtually synonymous. Paul is invoking an Old Testament pattern of equating the covenant with written texts: e.g. 'the *book* of the covenant' (Exod. 24:7), 'he *wrote* . . . the words of the covenant' (Exod. 34: 28), 'the covenant *written* in this Book' (Deut. 29: 21).

[53] Note also the vivid similarities between Rev. 22: 18–19 and Deut. 28: 58–9, 'If you are not careful to observe all the words of this law which are written in this book, to fear this honored and awesome name, the LORD your God,[59] then the LORD will bring extraordinary plagues on you and your descendants, even severe and lasting plagues, and miserable and chronic sicknesses.' Both passages not only have the covenantal curse but also very similar wording: Rev. 22: 18–19: *τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ* ('written in this book') and Deut. 28: 58: *τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ* ('written in this book'). This brings further confirmation that

formula . . . does suggest that he regarded his book as the record of divine revelation that was both complete (and so unalterable) and sacred.'[54]

The Didache (c.100)

One of earliest Christian writings, the *Didache*, continues to affirm this same approach to the reproduction of sacred texts. The manual declares, 'Do not abandon the commandments of the Lord (ἐντολὰς κυρίου), but guard (φυλάξεις) what you have received, neither adding to them (προστιθεὶς) or taking away (ἀφαιρῶν).'[55] It is obvious that the author is drawing an express parallel to Deuteronomy 4: 2 (LXX), 'You shall not add (προσθήσετε) to the word that I command you, nor take from it (ἀφελεῖτε), that you may keep (φυλάσσεσθε) the commandments of the LORD (ἐντολὰς κυρίου).' Most noteworthy here is that the 'commandments of the Lord' in the *Didache* are no longer a reference to the Old Testament commandments as in Deuteronomy 4: 2, but now refer to the teachings of Jesus. Therefore, the teachings of Jesus, wherever those may be found, not only bear equal (if not superior) authority to the Old Testament, but now they have a new 'inscriptional curse' attached to them—the people must be careful that they are 'neither adding to them or taking away'. Although such an inscriptional curse could be adapted to preserve oral tradition (possibly done by Polycarp and the *Epistle of Barnabas* below), its historical usage from Deuteronomy to Josephus, as noted above, implies a *written* text. Such a written text is suggested in *Didache* 8: 2, 'Nor should you pray like the hypocrites, but as the *Lord commanded in his gospel*, you should pray as follows, "Our Father in heaven . . . " '[56] Here we have a reference to what Jesus 'commanded' and are told it is contained in a 'gospel' and then this text proceeds to cite the Lord's prayer in a manner very close to Matthew 6: 9–13. Although we cannot know for certain that it is a citation from Matthew's Gospel, Christopher Tuckett observes that 'it seems hard to resist the notion that there is some relationship between the *Didache* and Matthew here'.[57]

the author of Revelation has intentionally patterned his covenantal curses after the Deuteronomic archetype and thus presents his book as equally authoritative as Old Testament scripture.

[54] Aune, *Revelation*, 1231. See also, T. Nicklas, ' "The Words of the Prophecy of this Book": Playing with Scriptural Authority in the Book of Revelation', in M. Popović, ed., *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2010), 309–26.

[55] *Didache* 4.13.

[56] *Didache* 8.2 (emphasis mine).

[57] Christopher Tuckett, 'The *Didache* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Gregory and Tuckett, *Reception of the New Testament*, 106. Metzger, *Canon of the New Testament*, 51, is even more confident than Tuckett. Other scholars disagree and some have argued that Matthew is either dependent upon the *Didache* or that they are both dependent upon a common source; see Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*; R. Glover, 'The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels', *NTS* 5 (1958): 12–29; J. S. Kloppenborg, 'The Use of the Synoptics or

Papias (c.120)

One of the earliest explicit references to the canonical gospels by name comes from Papias where he passes along the earlier tradition from the Elder that, 'Mark was the interpreter (ἑρμνημόνευσεν) of Peter, he wrote down accurately everything that he recalled of the Lord's words and deeds . . . For he was intent on just one purpose: *to leave out nothing that he heard or to include any falsehood* among them.'[58] The italicized portion of this statement is a clear echo of the 'neither adding or taking away' principle of Deuteronomy 4: 2 and is here being applied specifically to a New Testament book (Mark).[59] Whether or not one understands ἑρμνημόνευσεν as 'interpreter' or 'translator',[60] this passage provides critically early testimony—especially given that Papias received this tradition from an even earlier source (the Elder)—that Christians were concerned that their stories of Jesus were accurately preserved in written form and (if need be) accurately translated.

Epistle of Barnabas (c.130)

While exhorting Christians in the 'path of light', *Barnabas* 19.11 declares, 'Guard (φυλάξεις) the injunctions you have received, neither adding (προστιθεὶς) to them nor taking away (ἀφαιρῶν).' The author—again drawing clear parallels to Deuteronomy 4: 2—continues to affirm that early Christians were concerned to pass along their tradition with care not to make alterations or changes. It is unclear whether *Barnabas* is referring to the preservation of oral or written tradition (or both), but, as argued above, the author likely cites from *written* Jesus tradition, 'It is written, "many are called, but few are chosen." '[61]

Dionysius of Corinth (c.170)

Frustrated with alterations to his own writings, Dionysius says, 'The apostles of the devil have filled them with tares, *by leaving out some things and putting*

Q in Did. 1.3b–2.1', in H. van de Sandt, ed., *The Didache and Matthew: Two Documents from the same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 105–29; A. Milavec, 'Synoptic Tradition in the Didache Revisited', *JECS* 11 (2003): 443–80; and A. J. P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004).

[58] Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.39.15. For discussion of Papias as a historical source see S. Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002), 272–92; R. H. Gundry, *Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 1026–45; and M. Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SCM, 1985), 47–53.

[59] Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 208–9.

[60] Ibid. 205–10. It is noteworthy that the 'neither adding or taking away' theme is used in some instances to refer to the accuracy of *translations* (e.g., Philo, *Mos.* 2.34; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.5).

[61] *Barn.* 4.14; emphasis mine.

in others. But woe awaits them. Therefore it is no wonder that some have gone about to falsify even the scriptures of the Lord.'[62] Dionysius invokes the language of the 'inscriptional curse' and indicates that if such behavior is worthy of judgment for his inferior writings, how much more so for when people change the 'scriptures of the Lord'.[63]

Irenaeus (c.180)

The application of the Deuteronomy 4: 2 principle to the transmission of Christian texts continues in the writings of Irenaeus who complains about copyists who have changed the number 666 in Revelation 13: 18 to 616. After stating that 666 stood in 'all the most approved and ancient copies' (*ἐν πάσι τοῖς σπουδαίοις και ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις*) he reminds the reader, 'there shall be no light punishment [inflicted] upon him who either adds or subtracts anything from the Scripture'.[64] Such harsh language is particularly noteworthy given the relatively minor nature of the textual change in Revelation 13: 18. Elsewhere, Irenaeus affirms a similar attitude of care towards the reproduction of Christian scripture when he claims that the church's doctrine is 'being guarded and preserved without any forging of Scriptures . . . neither receiving addition nor [suffering] curtailment'.[65]

Anonymous critic of Montanism (c.196)

Eusebius relays the comments of an anti-Montanist writer who is hesitant to produce a document against the Montanists 'not from the lack of any ability to refute the lie . . . but from timidity and scruples lest I might seem to some to be adding to the writings or injunctions of the word of the new covenant of the gospel (*τῷ τῆς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καινῆς διαθήκης λόγῳ*) to which no one . . . can add and from which he cannot take away'.[66] Although the writer appears to be applying the Deuteronomy 4: 2 principle on a canonical level (not adding or taking away *books*), there is little doubt that he would have the same scruples about anyone altering individual texts within the canon.

[62] *H.E.* 4.23.12 (emphasis mine).

[63] Curiously, B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York: OUP, 1993), uses this reference to Dionysius to argue that scribes (whether heretical or orthodox) were changing the text of the New Testament, showing that he, at least, views 'Scriptures of the Lord' as referring to New Testament writings (26).

[64] *Haer*. 5.13.1.

[65] *Haer*. 4.33.8. See also the same language in 1.10.2.

[66] *H.E.* 5.16.3.

Additional Testimony Regarding Textual Preservation

In addition to the Deuteronomy 4: 2 formula, there are additional kinds of statements from pre-200 AD authors regarding the transmission of Christian tradition. Here are a few notable examples.

Polycarp (c.110)

While describing those who engage in wicked behavior, Polycarp makes sure to include 'whosoever perverts (*μεθοδεύῃ*) the oracles of the Lord (*τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*) to his own lusts'.[67] Even if Polycarp is using this phrase to refer to oral traditions of Jesus,[68] it still reflects concern that those traditions be carefully preserved—an attitude that would likely continue once those traditions were written down.[69] Moreover, there are good reasons to think that *τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου* may be a reference to New Testament writings, given that (i) in the very next verse Polycarp refers again to the *λόγον* and then appears to quote from Matthew 26: 41;[70] and (ii) it is quite likely that Polycarp knew and used New Testament writings since, as noted above, he seems to call Ephesians 'scripture' in *Phil* 12.1.[71]

Justin Martyr (c.150)

Justin in his *Dialogue* complains that some Jews were altering the scriptures, 'And from the sayings of Jeremiah they have cut out the following: "I [was] like a lamb that is brought to the slaughter" . . . [and] this passage from the sayings

[67] *Phil* 7.1.

[68] The phrase is used in regard to the preservation of oral tradition from time to time; e.g. see Polycrates' defense of the date of the celebration of the Passover (Eusebius, *H.E.* 5.24.2). There is also the possibility that *Phil* 7.1 is a reference to perverted *interpretations* of the scriptures, but we cannot be sure.

[69] Even more to the point is the fact that the New Testament documents were often viewed within early Christianity as the embodiment of oral tradition passed down by (and from) the Apostles. Thus, express attitudes about the preservation of oral tradition would naturally apply to those traditions once they are manifested in written texts. See Justin, *Apol.* 66.3; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.1; O. Cullmann, 'The Tradition', in *The Early Church* (London: SCM, 1956), 59–99; F. F. Bruce, *Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), 29–38; and id., 'Tradition and the Canon of Scripture', in D. K. McKim, ed., *The Authoritative Word* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 59–84. Josephus provides a similar example of this sort of tradition when he refers to the *παράδοσιν* he set down in writing (*C.Ap.* 1.49–50; cf. *Ant.* 13.297).

[70] *Phil* 7.2. Those who agree Matthew is being used here include Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 114–15; É. Massaux, *Influence de L'Évangile de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Saint Irénée* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1986), ii.31-2; and Dehandschutter, 'Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians', 288.

[71] It is also noteworthy that *τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου* was a common designation for scripture in the writings of this general time period; e.g. Acts 7: 38; Rom. 3: 2; Heb. 5: 12; *1 Clem.* 19.1, 53.1, 62.3; *2 Clem.* 13.3; Papias, *H.*E. 3.39.15–16; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.1.

of Jeremiah is still written in some copies in the synagogues of the Jews (for it is only a short time since they were cut out).'[72] Regardless of whether Justin's complaint is accurate, he bases his argument on a principle accepted by both himself and his audience: the scriptures are not to be altered or changed. If Justin viewed the 'memoirs of the apostles' as authoritative as Old Testament scripture (and we cannot enter into that discussion here[73]), it is reasonable to think that his attitude toward their alteration would be the same.

Irenaeus (c.180)

Irenaeus expresses his concern about careful copying of his own writings when he adds an exhortation at the conclusions of one his letters, 'I adjure thee, who shalt copy out of this book . . . that thou compare what thou shalt transcribe and correct it with this copy whence thou art transcribing, with all care.'[74] If Irenaeus was so concerned about changes to his own writings, then no doubt his concern about changes in the scripture would be equal if not greater. This concern is borne out by his severe criticism of the Valentinians for how they take the scriptures and 'dismember and destroy the truth' which is in them 'by transferring passages" and 'adapting the oracles of the Lord to their opinions'.[75] And, of course, this same attitude is evident when Irenaeus condemns the actions of Marcion because he 'mutilated the Gospel which is according to Luke . . . [and] dismembered the epistles of Paul'.[76]

Anonymous author (c.200)

Although this testimony comes at the end of our timeframe, it is worth noting the anonymous author cited by Eusebius who critiques the heretics of his day because they 'lay hands on the divine scriptures (θείαις γραθαῖς), saying that they had corrected them . . . their disciples have diligently written out copies corrected, as they say, but really corrupted (ἠφανισμένα) by each of them . . . The impudence of this sin can scarcely be unknown even to them.'[77] Again, whether or not the author's accusations are accurate is immaterial—our concern here is to note his *attitude* to the text. Given that the doctrinal dispute in

[72] *Dial.* 72.

[73] For an overview of this question, see C. E. Hill, 'Justin and the New Testament Writings', in E. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 42–8. It is noteworthy that, according to Justin, these 'memoirs' were ready in public worship alongside the OT writings (*1 Apol* 67.3).

[74] Eusebius, *H.E.* 5.20.2.

[75] *Haer*. 1.8.1. See similar critiques of Marcion in 1.27.2.

[76] *Haer*. 1.27.2.

[77] *H.E.* 5.28.15–18. Some have argued Eusebius is quoting Hippolytus; see R. H. Connolly, 'Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* V.28', *JTS* 49 (1948): 73–9.

view here is decidedly Christological, there is little doubt that the θείαις γραθαῖς are referring to books of the New Testament (though it is unclear which ones).[78]

Again, this quick overview of pre-200 CE testimony is not easy to interpret. It is difficult to know whether this testimony is representative of early Christianity as a whole or whether it simply reflects the attempts of some Christian *leaders* to control an unwieldy religion where the average Christian was quite content to change the text. After all, perhaps the best evidence for a loose Christian attitude toward the text is the degree to which the church fathers have to condemn changes to it! However, while this remains a compelling possibility, there are challenges to this interpretation. Most notably, the attitudes expressed above have broad attestation and are remarkably uniform across the spectrum of early Christian writings (largely due to the fact that these attitudes are rooted in the Deuteronomy 4: 2 principle inherited from Judaism). In addition, these Christian leaders are precisely the ones who would be teaching and preaching from these texts and would have therefore borne considerable influence over how Christians in their locale would have viewed these texts and subsequently copied them. Although some Christians clearly did not follow this broader attitude (as the above texts make clear), this does not mean there was no broader attitude.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has been narrowly concerned with *express* testimony by early Christians regarding the scriptural status of their texts, and their general approach to their transmission. When that testimony is considered, it is not at all clear, in spite of oft-made claims to the contrary, that textual variations in the papyri demonstrate the non-scriptural status of New Testament books and a casual attitude to their reproduction. Instead, it seems evident that two historical realities *coexisted* within early Christianity: early Christians, as a whole, valued their texts as scripture and did not view unbridled textual changes as acceptable, and, at the same time, some Christians changed the New Testament text and altered its wording (and sometimes in substantive ways). Although it is tempting to alleviate the tension between these two realities by denying one of them, that option does not appear to be open to us. Early Christianity was more complex than that.

When both of these realities are recognized, then it becomes clear that a high view of these texts (and concern over their transmission) is not mutually exclusive with the existence of significant textual variation. On the contrary, a

[78] The 'heresy' is evidently some form of adoptionism promoted by Theodotus (*H.E.* 5.28.1–9).

rich irony within the field of textual criticism is that scribes were more likely to try to correct a text (rightly or wrongly) if they held it to be sacred and in need of careful preservation. Thus, the early Christian belief that these books were scripture would not have stopped all changes, but would have actually *led* to some changes, as Christians tried to fix what they deemed to be mistakes in the text. Indeed, Colwell makes the *opposite* argument to McDonald and Koester above, 'Most of the manuals and handbooks now in print . . . will tell you these variations were fruit of careless treatment which was possible because the books of the New Testament had not yet attained a strong position as "Bible." The reverse is the case. It was because they were the religious treasure of the church that they were changed.'[79] No doubt a similar explanation can be given for why scribes harmonized the text or changed the text for theological reasons—in both cases the text was so important that scribes wanted to make sure that it said the 'right' thing.

In the end, it seems that early Christianity, in regard to the transmission of its text, was a religion being pulled in different directions by (at least) two competing forces—a general attitude of fidelity to the text and a willingness to change the text to make it say what it was known to mean. No doubt this is a partial explanation (but by no means the whole) for why we see a mix of 'free' and 'strict' texts throughout our early textual tradition. Moreover, this 'polarized' situation in the transmission of early Christian texts may be particularly useful for assessing those earliest unobservable stages that our inductive evidence cannot reach. Although we have no reason to think the text in the unobservable stages was being transmitted only with strict fidelity, we also have no reason to think it was being transmitted only with wild and unbridled textual alterations. The matrix of early Christian attitudes toward textual reproduction suggests that we should expect no greater level of textual diversity in the earliest stages than we find preserved in our current manuscript tradition.[80]

[79] E. C. Colwell, *What is the Best New Testament?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), 52–3. A similar opinion is expressed by K. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), 124.

[80] Wisse, 'Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts', observes, 'There is no indication that the Gospels circulated in a form different from that attested in later textual traditions' (52). In other words, textual changes made in the unobservable stages are still visible in later MSS. See also the discussion of the 'tenacity' of the text in Aland and Aland, *Text of the New Testament*, 291–5.

II

The Manuscript Tradition

This page intentionally left blank

5

The Early Text of Matthew

Tommy Wasserman

INTRODUCTION

Views of the early New Testament text have been formed from two main types of materials: the earliest manuscripts, mainly written on papyrus, and the patristic citations. This chapter focuses on the first category.[1] Today, there are 127 registered papyri, about sixty of which contain Gospel material.[2] Of these sixty, about thirty-five date from the second to mid-fourth century, before the presumed date of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Thirteen of these thirty-five early Gospel texts contain portions of text from the Gospel of Matthew.[3] The extant manuscript evidence confirms what we know from patristic sources, that Matthew and John were the most popular Gospels, whereas Luke and especially Mark were less popular.[4]

In the following I will give a description of these early witnesses to Matthew and analyze their text. Apart from the *editiones principes*, I will interact extensively with Kyoung Shik Min's significant study of these MSS.[5] Min provides detailed descriptions, transcriptions, and analyses with extensive bibliographies for each witness.

[1] For current views of the early New Testament text, see T. Wasserman, 'The Implications of Textual Criticism for Understanding the "Original Text"', in E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson, eds., *Mark and Matthew* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming); and for early patristic citations, see Ch. 14 of this volume.

[2] Cited 27 Jan. 2010 from the official register of New Testament MSS, administrated by the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, Münster: http://intf.uni-muenster.de/vmr/NTVMR/ListeHandschriften.php.

[3] Recently, Roger Bagnall has questioned the dating of the New Testament papyri to the 2nd cent. See R. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: PUP, 2009), 1–24. Cf. L. Hurtado, review of Roger S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt*, *RBL* [http://www.bookreviews.org] (2010).

[4] John: 17 MSS; Matthew: 13–14 MSS; Luke: 6 MSS; Mark: 1 MS (note that $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ contain more than one gospel).

[5] K. S. Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2005).

METHOD OF TEXTUAL EVALUATION

In the textual analysis I will basically use the same method which Min used in the hope of refining some of his results. He classifies the MSS in two ways: first, according to their general textual quality *(Textqualität)*, that is, the degree of correspondence with the reconstructed initial text, which in this case is equal to the NA^{27}; and, secondly, according to their character of transmission (*Überlieferungsweise*), that is, how well did each scribe copy the exemplar. Three main categories are used in both classifications: 'strict', 'normal', and 'free', although Min suggests that $\mathfrak{P}^{110}$ has a 'very free' transmission character.[6]

This method for evaluating papyri, including the categories, was devised by Kurt Aland and subsequently developed by Barbara Aland (Min's doctoral supervisor), especially its application to small papyri.[7] Contrary to Min, however, the Alands do not distinguish systematically between the textual quality (of the underlying exemplar) and the transmission character.[8] More recently, Barbara Aland has distinguished between 'free' transmission due to carelessness, and 'free' transmission due to editorial changes.[9]

Admittedly this method of evaluation involves an unavoidable element of subjectivity, since the judgments are based on a comparison with the hypothetically reconstructed initial text in NA^{27}, which in turn is close to the text of the fourth-century codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.[10] Further, whereas the distinction between textual quality and transmission is useful, it should be made with caution, especially in regard to small fragments. Numbers and percentages are more important than corresponding labels like 'free', 'normal', and 'strict', but the validity of the results ultimately depends on the size of the sample and the specific nature and pattern of textual variation—variants should be weighed as well as counted.

[6] Ibid. 251.

[7] K. and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, tr. E. F. Rhodes, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 96–101; B. Aland, 'Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments', in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 1–13.

[8] The categorization of $\mathfrak{P}^{1-96}$ indicated in the Alands' handbook seems to focus primarily on textual quality. Elsewhere, however, Barbara Aland emphasizes the transmission character. See e.g. B. Aland, 'Die Münsteraner Arbeit am Text des Neuen Testaments und ihr Beitrag für die frühe Überlieferung des 2. Jahrhunderts: Eine methodologische Betrachtung', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 61.

[9] B. Aland, 'Kriterien', 2.

[10] Cf. B. D. Ehrman, 'A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts', *Bib* 70 (1989): 377–88.

Obvious errors and singular readings can more confidently be attributed to the scribe, especially if there is a discernible pattern. Such variation should primarily affect the evaluation of transmission character—not the textual quality referring to the exemplar. On the other hand, non-singular readings may also be creations of the scribe, and agreement with other witnesses coincidental. In cases where there is a closer genealogical connection between witnesses, their shared readings are more likely to have been present in the exemplars.

Finally, it should be noted that this method of evaluation is based on variation-units included in the NA^{27} apparatus, supplemented with variation-units where each MS differs from the printed text.[11] If one were to include all known textual variation in the comparison, the MSS under consideration would appear statistically closer to the initial text.

THE EARLY WITNESSES TO MATTHEW: OVERVIEW AND CLASSIFICATION

Table 5.1 gives an overview of the MSS including the classifications of textual quality and transmission character.[12] In regard to textual quality, the category 'at least normal' is used to indicate uncertainty in some cases.

ANALYSIS

In the following the text and transcription of each witness will be examined. In particular, I will interact with Min's textual analysis. It is to be understood that the data agree with Min's account unless otherwise is indicated. The tables for each witness indicate only the number of legible variation-units (var.-units) on which this analysis is based. Textual variation is indicated as follows: addition (A); omission (O); substitution (SUB); transposition of word order (W/O). Orthographic changes are not included unless otherwise noted.

[11] For a discussion and definition of 'variation-unit', see E. J. Epp, 'Toward the Clarification of the Term "Textual Variant" ', in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 49–50.

[12] One uncial, 0171, dating from this period is included. I have chosen to exclude P.Ant. 2.54 with Matt 6: 10–12, which is likely an amulet.

Table 5.1. Early Witnesses to Matthew (2nd to mid 4th centuries)

Gr.-Al. No.	*Editio princeps*	Date[a]	Provenance	Size[b]	Contents (of Matt.)	Textual quality	Transmission character
𝔓1	B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* I (1898), 4–7.	III	Oxyrhynchus	(*c*.13×25)	1:1–9, 12, 14–20	strict	strict
𝔓35	E. Pistelli, *Papiri greci e latini della Società Italiana* I (1912), 1–2.	IV (?)[c]	Oxyrhynchus	8.2×9 (*c*.15×23–4)	25:12–15, 20–3	strict	strict
𝔓37	H. A. Sanders, 'An Early Papyrus Fragment of the Gospel of Matthew in the Michigan Collection', *HTR* 19 (1926): 215–26.	III/IV	Fayum?[d]	13.5×22.4 (*c*.15×25)	26:19–52	normal	free
𝔓45	F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* II. *The Gospels and Acts* (1933–4); H. Gerstinger, 'Ein Fragment des Chester Beatty-Evangelienkodex in der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Pap. graec. Vindob. 31974)', *Aeg* 13 (1933): 67–72; T. C. Skeat and B. C. McGing, 'Notes on Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus I (Gospels and Acts)', *Hermathena* 150 (1991): 21–5 (including a fragment of f.1 with Matt 20:24–6; 21:15).	III	Fayum or ancient Aphroditopolis?[e]	(*c*.20×25)	20:24–32; 21: 13–19; 25:41–26:39	normal	free (Min: normal)
𝔓53	H. A. Sanders, 'A Third Century Papyrus of Matthew and Acts', in R. P. Casey *et al.*, eds., *Quantulacumque* (1937), 151–61.	III	probably Fayum	(*c*.20–1×12)	26:29–40	strict	normal
𝔓64 + 67	C. H. Roberts, 'An Early Papyrus of the First Gospel', *HTR* 46 (1953): 233–7; R. Roca-Puig, *Un Papiro Griego del Evangelio de San Mateo* (1962).	*c*.200	Coptos (near Luxor)?[f]	(*c*.13×18)[g]	3:9, 15; 5:20–2, 25–8; 26:7–8, 10, 14–15, 22–3, 31–3	strict	strict (Min: normal)
𝔓70	E. Lobel *et al.*, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XXIV (1957), 4–5; M. Naldini, 'Nuovi frammenti del vangelo di Matteo', *Prom.* 1 (1975): 195–200.	III[h]	Oxyrhynchus	(*c*.15×25)	2:13–16; 2:22–3:1; 11:26–7; 12:4–5; 24:3–6, 12–15	strict	free
𝔓77	L. Ingrams *et al.*, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XXXIV (1968), 1–4; E. W. Handley *et al.*, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LXIV (1997), 1, 9–11 (no. 4405).	II/III	Oxyrhynchus	7×4.6; 8×8.2 (*c*.11×16)	23:30–9	strict	free

𝔓101	Handley, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LXIV, 1–4 (no. 4401).	III	Oxyrhynchus	4.7×8.6 (*c*.10×25)	3:10–12; 3:16–4:3	at least normal (Min: strict)	free
𝔓102	Handley, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LXIV, 4–5 (ed. J. D. Thomas; no. 4402).	III/V	Oxyrhynchus	5×3.3 (*c*.15×27)	4:11–12, 22–3	– (Min: strict)	– (Min: strict)
𝔓103	Handley, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LXIV, 5–7 (ed. J. D. Thomas; no. 4403).	II/III	Oxyrhynchus	8×4 (*c*.11×16)	13:55–6; 14:3–5	at least normal (Min: strict)	very free (Min: free)
𝔓104	Handley, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LXIV, 7–9 (ed. J. D. Thomas; no. 4404).	II	Oxyrhynchus	7×5.2 (*c*.13×18)[i]	21:34–7, 43, 45(?)	at least normal (Min: strict)	strict(?)
𝔓110	W. E. H. Cockle, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LXVI (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1999), 1–3 (no. 4494).	IV[j]	Oxyrhynchus	7×3.8 (*c*.11×20)	10:13–15, 25–7	at least normal (Min: strict)	very free
0171	K. Treu, 'Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente der Berliner Papyrussammlung', *APF* 18 (1966): 23–38 (only the Matthean fragment)	*c*.300	Aschmunen (ancient Hermopolis magna)	(*c*.11×15)	10:17–23, 25–32	normal	free

[a] Date according to K. Aland *et al*., eds., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (1994). The *Liste* is now digital: http://intf.uni-muenster.de/vmr/NTVMR/ListeHandschriften.php (accessed Jan. 2010).

[b] Measurements in parenthesis refer to reconstructed size (width × height). Measurements of extant fragments are excluded when there are more than two fragments.

[c] The date is controversial, 3rd–7th cent. See further K. Aland, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*, i. *Biblische Papyri* (1976), 257.

[d] The MS was purchased in Cairo in 1924, and many of the documents in the purchase came from Fayyum. See P. W. Comfort and D. P. Barrett, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (2001), 141. The textually related 𝔓45 may come from the same region.

[e] See F. G. Kenyon, *The Story of the Bible* (1936), 112.

[f] 𝔓64 was purchased in Luxor, Egypt. It is possible that 𝔓4, discovered at Coptos and purchased in Luxor, was copied by the same scribe.

[g] Here I follow Scott Charlesworth's reconstruction (13.5×17–18.5 cm): 'T. C. Skeat, 𝔓64+67 and 𝔓4, and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction', *NTS* 53 (2007): 587 n. 29.

[h] The first editors Turner (P. Oxy. 2384) and Naldini (PSI Inv. CNR 419, 420), respectively, dated the papyrus to the 4th century.

[i] J. D. Thomas (ed. pr.) indicates a reconstructed height of 25cm (so *Liste*; Comfort and Barrett; Min), which is clearly wrong since 9 of 31 lines are extant. Cf. S. Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', in C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias, eds., *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (2009), 155, table 1 (13×17–18.5 cm).

[j] The first editor W. E. H. Cockle dates 𝔓110 to the 4th cent., but at the same time notes the similarity of script to 𝔓45 (3rd cent.) and P. Flor. II 108 (ante *c*.260). The evidence points to the first half of the 4th century.

$\mathfrak{P}^{1}$ (P.Oxy. 2)

Some fragments from a bifolium of a codex, written in a reformed documentary hand with a tendency towards cursive.

Notes on transcription

Recto, l. 6 (1: 16): Comfort and Barrett and Min correctly transcribe *τον ιωσ̣ηφ* *contra* Grenfell and Hunt (*ed. pr.*) and other editors who omit the article.[13]

Recto, l. 32 (1:17): Min transcribes *αι* *contra* Grenfell and Hunt (*ed. pr.*) and other subsequent editors.[14] In my opinion, the sequence *ουν γϵνϵαι* (without *αι*) is rather clear.

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA^{27}	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
1: 1–9, 12, 14–20	11	1	3/12 (25%)	2 × O, 1 × SUB	1 × O

Min counts only two deviations, since he does not include the omission in 1: 17.[15] The two omissions of the definite article, one of which is a singular reading, may be due to homoioteleuton. Some orthographic variants relating to the transcription of names, and an itacistic verb form have been excluded from this analysis, except for the genealogically significant substitution in 1: 3 of *ζαρϵ* (with B mae) for *ζαρα* (txt).

In conclusion, $\mathfrak{P}^{1}$ reflects a 'strict' text, close to the initial text as reconstructed in NA^{27}. The scribe seems to have followed his exemplar closely reflecting a 'strict' transmission.

$\mathfrak{P}^{35}$ (PSI 1)

A fragmentary leaf from a bifolium of a codex, written in a reformed documentary hand(?) with relatively wide letters and ornamental strokes.[16]

[13] Cf. C. Wessely, *Les Plus Anciens Monuments du christianisme écrits sur papyrus* (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907): 144; E. M. Schofield, 'The Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament' (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1936), 91.

[14] Cf. Wessely, *Les Plus Anciens Monuments*, 144; Schofield, 'Papyrus Fragments', 91.

[15] Min, *Überlieferung*, 68.

[16] G. Cavallo, who dates $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$ to the 5th or 6th centuries, describes the hand as 'Alexandrian majuscule'. See G. Cavallo, 'Greek and Latin Writing in the Papyri', in R. Bagnall, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 129.

Notes on transcription

Verso, ll. 19–20 (25: 22): Min correctly includes the third *ταλαντα* in the verse in his reconstruction *contra* Pistelli (*ed. pr.*) and other editors.[17]

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA[27]	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
25:12–15, 20–3	6	–	1/6 (16.7%)	1 × O	1 × O

The single deviation refers to the probable omission of δέ in 25: 22 (with ℵ* *B pc* sa), enclosed in square brackets in NA[27].[18] Apart from the six variation-units where 𝔓[35] is extant, it is at least possible to establish that in 25: 20, where there is variation between *ἐκέρδησα* (*txt*) / *ἐκέρδησα ἐπ* (/*ἐν*) *αὐτοῖς*/*ἐπεκέρδησα*, 𝔓[35] does not support the second reading, attested by the Majority Text. Since 𝔓[35] reads *ἐκέρδησα* in v. 22, it probably read the same form in v. 20, which would result in an additional agreement with the printed NA[27] text. However, it should be noted that minuscule 700 attests to different forms in the respective two places.

In any case, 𝔓[35] clearly represents a 'strict' text close to the initial text. Further, the scribe seems to have followed the exemplar closely, hence a 'strict' transmission, probably also in the omission of δέ in 25: 22, which represents an early reading.

𝔓[37] (P.Mich. inv. 1570)

A fragmentary leaf from a bifolium of a codex written in a documentary hand with tendency towards cursive.

Notes on transcription

Verso, ll. 4–5 (26: 22): Sanders (*ed. pr.*) and other editors transcribe *ηρχαντο* [*λεγειν εκα*/*σ*]*τος αυτων*.[19] As Min points out, however, there is enough space for either *λεγειν αυτω εκαστος αυτων* (A W 074 *f*[1] 𝔐 sy[h] Eus)

[17] Cf. Schofield, 'Papyrus Fragments', 255; Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 139.
[18] There is hardly room for δὲ *καί* although the text cannot be reconstructed with full certainty.
[19] Cf. Schofield, 'Papyrus Fragments', 264; Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 141.

or *λεγειν εις εκαστος αυτων* (𝔓$^{45\text{vid}}$ D *Θ* f^{13} *pc* sy^{s}).[20] Both the fact that *εἷς* is slightly briefer and that 𝔓^{37} is very close to 𝔓^{45} speaks rather strongly in favor of the latter alternative.[21]

Verso, 1. 28 (26: 34): Kurt Aland transcribes *αλεκτορο[φωνιας* (*contra* Sanders and subsequent editors).[22] Thus, NA^{27} cites 𝔓$^{37\text{vid}}$ and 𝔓^{45} in favour of *ἀλεκτοροφωνίας*. Min acknowledges this possibility and says that the letter between *rho* and *phi* could be either an *alpha* or an *omicron*, but he prefers the former and transcribes *αλεκτοραφ[ωνησαι]*.[23] In my opinion, this uncertain variation-unit should not be counted among the agreements with the initial text.

Recto, l. 58 (26: 49): Min correctly points out that NA^{27} is wrong to cite 𝔓^{37} in favor of *αὐτῷ*, because of the subsequent long omission due to homoioteleuton/homoioarcton in 𝔓^{37} relating to *εἶπεν* which is repeated and followed by *αὐτῷ* in v. 50.[24] However, it is unclear how Min can be certain that the exemplar did not have the first *αὐτῷ*, although it is perhaps unlikely due to the affiliation to 𝔓^{45}.[25] Because of uncertainty, this variation-unit is excluded from my textual analysis.

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA^{27}	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
26:19–52	44	15	31/59 in 𝔓^{37*} (52.5%) 26/59 in 𝔓^{37c} (44.1%)	5 × A, 11 × O 1 × W/O, 14 × SUB	3 × A, 2 × O 8 × SUB

Min lists fifty-two variation-units in 26: 19–52, eight of which are illegible in 𝔓^{37}.[26] However, I count fifty-four variation-units, because I regard the variation in 26: 22, the addition/omission of *αὐτῷ* and *αὐτῶν*, as two distinct units; and the addition/omission of *καί* (post *μαθηταῖς*) in 26: 26 as another distinct unit. On the other hand, I count ten illegible units, since I exclude the

[20] Since the NA^{27} apparatus indicates 𝔓$^{37\text{vid}}$ for the omission of *αὐτῷ* in Matt. 26: 22, 𝔓$^{37\text{vid}}$ should probably be indicated in favour of the following reading *εἷς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν*, since there is clearly space for one of the two words *αὐτῷ* or *εἷς*.

[21] On the basis of the first argument, Min indicates 𝔓$^{37\text{vid}}$ in favor of *λεγειν εις εκαστος αυτων* in his apparatus. The symbol 𝔓 cited in support of *λεγειν αυτω εκαστος αυτων* is a typographical error.

[22] K. Aland, “Der neue ‘Standard-Text’ in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln”, in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 266.

[23] Min, *Überlieferung*, 84. Min should have marked the *alpha* with an underdot (cf. his apparatus where he indicates 𝔓$^{37\text{vid}}$).

[24] Ibid. 89 (Min wrongly indicates v. 48 for v. 49). [25] Ibid. 89 n. 3. [26] Ibid. 93.

uncertain passages in 26: 34 (*ἀλεκτοροφωνίας/ἀλεκτορα φωνῆσαι*) and 26: 49 (*αὐτῷ*).

In my opinion, Min's strong emphasis on the scribe's carelessness based on the high ratio of omissions is misleading.[27] It is necessary to look at each case to discern which words were likely omitted by the scribe. Significantly, several of the omissions (26: 21, 22, 29, 33, 44) are shared by one or more related witnesses (𝔓45 *Θ f*1 *f*13 700).[28]

On the whole, the deviances from NA27 in 𝔓37 hardly affect the meaning of the text. The major omission in 26: 49–50 is a haplography. A few of the variants may be due to harmonization to the immediate context or to a parallel, but this is uncertain. In five places the text has been corrected towards the initial text, probably by the original scribe.

A further assessment of the singular readings may shed some more light on the question of how careful the scribe was. There are thirteen singular readings (26: 24, 26, 31, 34, 38 (×2), 40 (×2), 41 (×2), 46, 49–50, 51), three of which are minor errors which have been corrected (26: 24, 26, 46); five others relate to the choice of verb forms (26: 38, 40 (×2), 41 (×2)); there is one dittography (26: 31) and one haplography (26: 49–50); then there are two additions of a conjunction (26: 34, 38), and one omission of the article (26: 51).

In light of these data, it is perhaps best to characterize the transmission as 'free', after all, but not far from 'normal'. As for textual quality, 𝔓37 has a 'normal' text, closely related to 𝔓45. However, it is not possible to assign 𝔓37 to any text type in Matthew. In fact, the text-type paradigm itself has become increasingly problematic from a methodological viewpoint.[29]

𝔓45 (P. Chester Beatty Biblical I; Pap. Vindob. Graec. 31974)

Thirty extant folios (of about 112) from a codex containing at least the four Gospels and Acts written in a reformed documentary hand.

Notes on transcription

Folio 2, recto, l. 4 (25: 42): Min reconstructs the beginning of the line as [*μοι φαγειν και*], which is probably correct (*contra* Kenyon's *ed. pr.*).

[27] Ibid. 96–7.

[28] Min explicitly states that these omissions, like the additions, are of such minor character that they are genealogically insignificant, and that their coincidental emergence is more probable (ibid. 96). I agree that one cannot be entirely certain about genealogical relationships on the basis of minor changes (the variants should be weighed), esp. not in this small sample of text. Note, however, that Min later acknowledges the close relationship between 𝔓37 and 𝔓45 and to D and *Θ* (ibid. 106–7).

[29] T. Wasserman, 'Criteria for Evaluating Readings in New Testament Textual Criticism', in B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

Folio 2, recto, l. 14 (26: 2): There is a staurogram in στρνα[ι] so the *tau* should be included in the transcription (*contra* Min, Comfort and Barrett, and Porter and Porter[30]).

Folio 2, recto, l. 33 (26: 15–16): There are a number of proposed reconstructions of the line, for example:

Gerstinger (*ed. pr.*): [στησαν αυτωι τριακοντα αργυρια και απο τοτε εζητει ευκα] ιραν ινα
Comfort and Barrett: [στησαν αυτωι τριακοντα αργυρια· απο τοτε εζητει ευκα]ι̣[ρ]ιαν ινα
Zuntz:[31] [στησαν αυτωι λʹ στατηρας και απο τοτε εζητει ευκα]ι̤[ρ]ιαν ινα

Min basically follows Gerstinger but inserts question marks since he thinks the presence of αυτωι and και is uncertain depending on whether τριακοντα was abbreviated (=λʹ).[32] My examination shows that the scribe uses either cardinal numbers or numerals for the numbers 12, 15, 18, 40, and 72, so the question is open.[33] However, there is no reason to introduce στατηρας read by D and some OL witnesses. This passage is excluded from the textual analysis.

Folio 2, verso, l. 65 (26: 36): Gerstinger (*ed. pr.*), followed by Comfort and Barrett, transcribes απελθων εκ[ει προσευξωμαι, κτλ., whereas Min includes εκει in square brackets, allowing for the word order προσευξωμαι εκει, attested by many witnesses. According to the Porters' recent transcription they see even less: απελθ̣ω̣ [ν κτλ.. In this case, it seems preferable to follow Gerstinger's initial transcription, since the papyrus has deteriorated considerably since his time.[34]

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA[27]	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
20:24–32; 21:13–19; 25:41–26:39	49	16	37/65 (56.9%)	8 × A 12 × O 6 × W/O 11 × SUB	2 × A 6 × O 2 × W/O 5 × SUB

30 S. E. Porter and W. J. Porter, eds., *New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments*, i. *Text* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2008).

31 G. Zuntz, 'Reconstruction of One Leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P[45])', *Chronique d'Égypte*, 26 (1951): 208; J. R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 113, accepts Zuntz's proposal.

32 Min, *Überlieferung*, 115.

33 The scribe always uses cardinal numbers below 12. For 12, the numeral ιβ occurs once (Mark 8: 19) wheras the cardinal number δώδεκα occurs four times; for 15, the cardinal number δεκαπντε occurs in John 11: 18, whereas numerals are used for the numbers 18 (Mark 8:19), 40 (Acts 7: 36), and 72 (Luke 10: 17). Cardinal numbers are used for 200 (Mark 6: 37), 4,000 (Mark 8: 20), 5,000 (Mark 6: 44), 10,000 (Luke 14: 31), and probably 100,000 (Luke 14: 31).

34 Hans Förster of the Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek reports in private correspondence that the papyrus is in bad condition. The papyrus will likely remain in its box where only the recto is accessible.

In contrast to Min, the variation-unit in 26: 36 (*ἐκεῖ προσεύξωμαι*) is included here based on Gerstinger's transcription. Further, the variations in 20: 29 (transposition and substitution) and in 26: 22 (omission and addition) are counted as four variation-units; I think, on the basis of the attestations, that the changes arose in two stages, respectively.[35] On the other hand, two variation-units are excluded: one that refers to Blass's conjecture in 25: 42; and, further, the reading 'ignem' (*πῦρ*) in 25: 46. None of these readings is attested in any Greek manuscript.

For some reason Min regards the omission of *οἱ* in 25: 41 as a scribal error.[36] However, the text makes perfect sense and the omission is shared by important witnesses (א B L 0128 0281 33 *pc*) and included in square brackets in NA27.

The many itacisms have been excluded, but one significant orthographic variant in 26: 36 (*γεσσημανει*) is counted among the substitutions. There is one correction to the text in Matthew (25: 42) by a different hand. There are eight harmonizations; six to the context and two to parallels. Six harmonizations are also singular readings, which reflects the scribe's harmonistic tendency.

It is striking that the many variant readings hardly affect the meaning of the text. E. C. Colwell said of this scribe: 'He sees through the language to its idea-content, and copies that—often in words of his own choosing, or in words rearranged as to order.'[37] Apart from the studies by Colwell and Min, James Royse supplies a vast amount of data in his analysis of 227 singular readings in 𝔓45.[38] He confirms Colwell's observation that the scribe seldom created nonsense readings; 218 of 227 singular readings (96%) read more or less smoothly and there are very few nonsense singulars.[39] However, he thinks Colwell overstated the matter when he said that '𝔓45 gives the impression of a scribe who writes without any intention of exactly reproducing his source', because, in general, the scribe did reproduce his source exactly.[40]

In conclusion, the textual quality of 𝔓45 should, in my opinion, be categorized as 'normal', whereas the transmission should be categorized as 'free' (*contra* Min: 'normal') reflecting the fact that the scribe copied his exemplar with a focus on its idea-contents and in that process changed the text to a considerable degree.[41] As for the textual affiliation of 𝔓45 in Matthew, we have

[35] Cf. ibid. 128 n. 20. [36] Ibid. 134.

[37] E. C. Colwell, 'Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of 𝔓46 𝔓66 𝔓75', in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 117. Cf. Min, *Überlieferung*, 135–7.

[38] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 103–97.

[39] Ibid. 123.

[40] Colwell, 'Method', 117; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 124. For a summary of the basic features of copying by this scribe, see ibid. 197.

[41] It should be noted that according to Min's own analysis 𝔓45 actually has a higher rate of differences against NA27 than 𝔓37 (58% vs. 52.5%); Cf. also Royse's comparison of six large papyri, where he concludes that 𝔓45 ranks at or toward the top in omissions, transpositions, additions, and substitutions (*Scribal Habits*, 905).

already seen that its text stands close to 𝔓37.[42] Although Comfort and Barrett have described 𝔓45 as standing "midway between the Alexandrian manuscripts and so-called Western manuscripts" in Matthew, Luke, and John, it is not possible to assign 𝔓45 to any text type in Matthew.[43]

𝔓53 (P.Mich. Inv. 6652)

Three fragments of two leaves written in a reformed documentary hand.

Notes on transcription

Verso, l. 12 (26: 32): Sanders (*ed. pr.*) begins his transcription of the line with [τα] δ̣ε. In my opinion, Min's transcription [τα τ]ο̣ is preferable.

Verso, l. 20 (26: 35): Min reconstructs the last word as [κα]ν̣, which seems correct (*contra* Sanders).

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA27	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
26:29–40	16	3	8/19 (42.1%)	1 × A, 2 × O 1 × W/O, 4 × SUB	1 × O, 1 × W/O

The variants involve minor issues, none of which alter the meaning of the text. Bart Ehrman thinks the addition of μου in 26: 39—a correction that, according to the first editor, was probably made by a second contemporary hand—is possibly an 'anti-Patripassionist' corruption.[44] However, the shorter reading without μου is poorly attested (𝔓53 L *Δ f*1 892 *pc* a vg^{ww}), and if it were original, it would be more natural to see the addition not as an orthodox corruption but as a harmonization to the context in v. 42.[45] The omission, in my opinion, is more likely a scribal error or a harmonization to the parallel in Luke 22: 42.

42 In Min's treatment of 𝔓45, the agreement with 𝔓37 in 26: 27 (τὸποτήριον) is lacking (*Überlieferung*, 119, 129, 146; cf. 83–4, 94).

43 Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 162.

44 B. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 1993), 272 n. 42. Ehrman does not mention the fact that it is a correction.

45 However, it should be noted that in v. 42 the omission of μου has even weaker attestation in other MSS (𝔓37*pc* a c h^{c}), a circumstance that speaks strongly in favor of the originality of the phrase πάτερ μου in both places, on the basis of external as well as intrinsic evidence.

Min observes that the deviations of 𝔓^{53} from NA^{27} are mostly singular or sub-singular, whereas a few others are read by a variety of MSS. This implies that most of the changes were made by the scribe himself, whereas the exemplar was of very good quality. Hence Min justifiably characterizes the textual quality as 'strict' and the transmission as 'normal'.[46]

𝔓$^{64+67}$ (Oxford, Magdalen College, Gr. 17; Montserrat, Abadia de Montserrat II 1)

Five fragments of three folios from a codex, written in two columns in a careful book hand; an early predecessor of the biblical uncial.

It has long been thought that a fragment with parts from Luke, 𝔓^{4} (housed at Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris), comes from the same four-gospel codex as 𝔓$^{64+67}$. Recently, however, Peter Head and Scott Charlesworth have argued against this identification, whereas C. E. Hill has defended it.[47] In any case, the fragments are most probably copied by the same scribe, and the textual character is also very similar.[48]

Notes on transcription

Fr. C of 𝔓^{64}, verso, col. 2, l. 2 (26: 14): Roberts (*ed. pr.*) transcribes *ι]β [ο] λεγομ[ενος*. Several other scholars have followed Carsten P. Thiede who thinks there is no space for the *omicron* and transcribes *ι]β̄ λεγομ[ενος*—a singular reading which is syntactically difficult.[49] It is more likely that the scribe wrote a smaller *omicron* placed above the line.[50] The reading is uncertain and excluded from my textual analysis.

Fr. C of 𝔓^{64}, recto, col. 1, l. 1 (26: 22): Thiede transcribes *τοσαυ]τ̣ω̣ν̣[μητιεγω*, implying that 𝔓^{64} read *εἷς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν* with 𝔓^{37vid} 𝔓^{45vid} D *Θ* *f*^{13} *pc*.[51] However, in my opinion, Roberts's transcription (*ed. pr.*), *αυ]τω· μ̣[ητι*, is

[46] Min, *Überlieferung*, 163.

[47] P. M. Head, 'Is 𝔓^{4}, 𝔓^{64} and 𝔓^{67} the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T. C. Skeat', *NTS* 51 (2005): 450–7; Charlesworth, 'T. C. Skeat, 𝔓$^{64+67}$ and 𝔓^{4},' 582–604; C. E. Hill, 'Intersections of Jewish and Christian Scribal Culture: The Original Codex Containing 𝔓^{4}, 𝔓^{64} and 𝔓^{67}, and its Implications', in R. Hvalvik and J. Kaufman, eds., *Among Jews, Gentiles, and Christians in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2011), 75–91.

[48] See T. Wasserman, 'A Comparative Textual Analysis of 𝔓^{4} and 𝔓$^{64+67}$', *TC* 15 (2010): 1–27.

[49] C. P. Thiede, 'Papyrus Magdalen 17 (Gregory-Aland 𝔓^{64}): A Reappraisal', *ZPE* 105 (1995): 14; Klaus Wachtel, '𝔓64/67: Fragmente des Matthäusevangeliums aus dem 1. Jahrhundert?', *ZPE* 107 (1995): 76; Min, *Überlieferung*, 168 n. 1; Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 68; 'T. C. Skeat, 𝔓$^{64+67}$ and 𝔓^{4}', 585.

[50] On the recto, l. 2 of this fragment there is another small *omicron*. Cf. 𝔓^{4} (probably by the same scribe), fr. D, recto, col. 2, l. 26 (Luke 6: 14), *αυ]του̣*.

[51] Thiede, 'Papyrus Magdalen 17', 15. Cf. Wachtel, 'Fragmente', 76, who agrees with Roberts.

more accurate. Thus, $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$ read either *λέγειν εἶς ἕκαστος αὐτῷ* (so Comfort and Barrett), or *εἶς ἕκαστος λέγειν αὐτῷ*, or *λέγειν* (*ἕκαστος*) *αὐτῷ* —in any case a singular reading involving an omission or transposition.

Fr. A of $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$, recto, col. 2, ll. 2–3 (26: 31): Roberts (*ed. pr.*) erroneously transcribes *αυτοις ο ιη παν*[*τες*] *σκανδα̣*[*λισθησεσθε*, but corrects the *nomen sacrum* to *ι̅ς̅* in a later publication.[52] Moreover, Roberts's transcription, which omits *ὑμεῖς*, is followed by Thiede, Skeat, and Min.[53] The omission would be a singular reading—possibly a harmonization to Mark 14: 27. However, this reconstruction of l. 2 is based on the assumption that there is not enough room for *ὑμεῖς*. This is far from certain, considering the general irregularity of the lines in $\mathfrak{P}^{64} + {}^{67}$, also apparent in $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$. As Wachtel points out, it is best in this case to leave the question open; this possible omission has been excluded from the analysis.[54]

Fr. B of $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$, recto, col. 2, l. 1 (26: 33): Roberts (*ed. pr.*) transcribes *γαλεγ̣λαιαν*, followed by Thiede, Wachtel, Min, and Charlesworth; however Skeat followed by Comfort and Barrett, transcribes *γαλε̣ιλαιαν* (itacism).[55] The latter itacistic reading shared by the closely related Codex B is easier to assume than an error—especially with this careful scribe.

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA[27]	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
3:9, 15; 5:20–2, 25–8; 26:7–8, 10, 14–15, 22–3, 31–3	13	–	2/13 (15.4%)	1 × O 1 × W/O or O	1 × W/O or O

I have counted only one variation-unit in 26: 22 because of the uncertain reading (W/O or O). The MS agrees with the reconstructed initial text in eleven variation-units, whereas it deviates twice from the initial text: one omission and one transposition (possibly involving an omission), which is a

[52] See C. H. Roberts, 'Complementary Note', in R. Roca-Puig, *Un papiro griego del Evangelio de San Mateo* (Barcelona: Grafos S.A., 1962), 59–60.

[53] Thiede, 'Papyrus Magdalen 17', 15; T. C. Skeat, 'The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?', *NTS* 43 (1997): 13; Min, *Überlieferung*, 169. However Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 70, include the pronoun.

[54] Wachtel, 'Fragmente', 76.

[55] Thiede, 'Papyrus Magdalen 17', 15; Wachtel, 'Fragmente', 76; Min, *Überlieferung*, 170; Charlesworth, 'T. C. Skeat, $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$', 585; Skeat, 'Four Gospels', 13; Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 70 (*γαλειλαιαν*). Apparently, a small horizontal smudge seems to have been impressed on the papyrus later making the iota look a bit like a compressed gamma. However, there are two similar strokes on the next line, where it is obvious that they do not belong to the original writing.

singular reading. None of the variant readings alter the meaning of the text in any significant way. In conclusion, I agree with Min that the 𝔓$^{64+67}$ represents a 'strict' text, but in my opinion the transmission character is also 'strict'. This different assessment is due to several differences between our transcriptions and the fact that Min included two uncertain (singular) readings, which are excluded from this analysis (cf. above).

𝔓^{70} (Oxford, Sackler Library, P.Oxy. 2384; Florence, Istituto Papirologico 'G. Vitelli,' PSI inv. 3407)

Three fragments of three folios from a codex, written in a reformed documentary hand.

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA^{27}	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
23:30–9	7	5	7/1 (58.3%)	2 × O 1 × W/O	1 × O 4 × SUB

The variation-unit in 2: 15 that refers to a versional witness has been excluded. The six substitutions involve minor issues that do not affect the meaning of the text; three are singular readings, and two sub-singular. The omission (*τοῦτο* in 24:14) has been corrected by a second hand. There is one harmonization to the context and one to a parallel. Two additional variants may be due to harmonization to general usage.

In sum, I agree with Min that the exemplar seems to have been of good quality, hence 𝔓^{70} represents a 'strict' text, whereas the scribe has made relatively many mistakes when he copied reflecting a 'free' transmission.[56]

𝔓^{77} (Oxford, Sackler Library, P. Oxy. 2683/P. Oxy. 4405)

Two fragments of one folio from a codex, written in a reformed documentary hand. Although treated separately here, it is quite possible that 𝔓^{103} (P.Oxy. 4403) belongs to the same codex.[57]

[56] Ibid. 193.

[57] Thomas in Handley, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXIV*, 6; Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 609; Min, *Überlieferung*, 200, 231–2.

Notes on transcription

Recto, l. 29 (23: 38–9): J. D. Thomas (*ed. pr.* of P.Oxy 4405) transcribes *αφειεται υμιν ο* [c. 8]. *λϵ*, whereas Min has *α̣φειεται υμιν ο* [*οικος υμων*]. *λ̣ϵ̣*[*γω*]. Comfort and Barrett transcribe *αφιεται ϋμινὁ̣ ο̣*[*ικος υμων ερημο*]*ς̣λ̣ϵ̣*. I agree with Min that the space is *c*.10 letters long and probably did not include *ερημος*—the citation of 𝔓77vid in support of *ἔρημος* in NA27 is misleading. The omission is shared by B L ff2 sys sa bopt (cf. Luke 13: 35).

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA27	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
23:30–9	7	5	7/1 (58.3%)	2 × O 1 × W/O	1 × O 4 × SUB

One omission, a singular reading, has subsequently been corrected by the scribe. Another correction involves the spelling of a verb. Knowledge of the parallel in Luke 13: 34–5 has probably influenced the scribe to harmonize at two points; one is the omission of *ἔρημος* in 23: 38 (cf. Luke 13: 35).

Other deviant readings hardly affect the meaning of the text. The evidence points to a rather careless scribe who had access to an exemplar of good quality. Hence, Min rightly indicates a 'strict' text and a 'free' transmission.[58]

𝔓101 (Oxford, Sackler Library, P.Oxy. 4401)

One fragment of a codex written in a reformed documentary hand.

Notes on transcription

Verso, ll. 8–9 (3: 11): J. D. Thomas (*ed. pr.*) transcribes [*βαστ*]*α̣*[*σ*]*αι*), whereas Comfort and Barrett have [*κυψας λ*]*υ*[*σ*]*αι*—a singular reading. Thomas mentions this as a possibility because of the uncertain letter (*alpha*/*upsilon*). A singular reading, however, is more unlikely and does not fit the space equally well.

58 Ibid. 207–8.

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA^{27}	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
3:10–12; 3:16–4:3	9	3	7/12 (58.3%)	2 × O 2 × W/O 3 × SUB	1 × O 1 × W/O 1 × SUB

The omission of *ὀπίσω μου* in 3: 11 with Cyprianus and some versional witnesses could be viewed as a conscious alteration avoiding the implication that Jesus was John's disciple (cf. Matt. 16: 24). On the other hand, Peter Head thinks the reading 'may reflect a feeling that *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* should be a technical title' (cf. Matt. 11: 3; 21: 9; 23: 39).[59]

The other variants hardly affect the sense of the text. As many as three variants may represent harmonizations to parallels, and another to the context. Three deviations are singular readings and three others are shared by few but diverse witnesses, and could be modifications by the scribe. Therefore, I think $\mathfrak{P}^{101}$ represents a text 'at least normal' and a 'free' transmission.

$\mathfrak{P}^{102}$ (Oxford, Sackler Library, P.Oxy. 4402)

A tiny fragment of a codex written in a reformed documentary hand.

Notes on transcription

The reconstruction of the text in 4: 23 suggests that $\mathfrak{P}^{102}$ attests to the printed NA^{27} text: *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ* with *B (k) sy^{c} sa mae*. Other witnesses attest to a number of different readings that add the subject *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* in various positions.

Min cautiously categorizes both text and transmission of $\mathfrak{P}^{102}$ as 'strict'.[60] In my opinion, it is too fragmentary to be evaluated.[61]

$\mathfrak{P}^{103}$ (Oxford, Sackler Library, P.Oxy. 4403)

A small fragment of a codex written in a reformed documentary hand. It is possible that $\mathfrak{P}^{77}$ (P.Oxy. 2683/P.Oxy. 4405) comes from the same codex.

[59] P. M. Head, 'Some Recently Published NT Papyri from Oxyrhynchus: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment', *TynBul* 51 (2000): 8. The reading was discussed already in 1697 by Jean Le Clerc. See Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, ed. and tr. Glenn W. Most (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 69 n. 30.

[60] Min, *Überlieferung*, 223.

[61] Cf. B. Aland, 'Kriterien,' 11.

Notes on transcription

Recto, l. 5 (13: 56): There is space for a few letters in addition to the reconstructed words [προς ημας] at the beginning of the line. David Parker suggests ωδε προς ημας as a possibility (a harmonization to Mark 6: 3). He further thinks the otherwise unattested omission of the word εισιν, subsequently added supralinearly, may also reflect influence from the parallel in Mark.[62]

Verso, l. 8 (14: 4): The space permits about 6 or 7 more letters than the reconstructed εχ[ειν αυ], but there is no known variation at this point. Although it is impossible to know, Min suggests the reading εχειν γυναικα ταυτην as a possibility, which would reflect influence from Mark 6: 18.[63] On the other hand, the space on the verso, l. 7 (14: 4) is not large enough for the reading γαρ ο ιωαννης αυτω, adopted in NA²⁷. Thomas (*ed. pr.*) thinks αυτω was omitted, a reading which is attested by a few other witnesses (א* [sine o] 565 *pc*).[64]

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA²⁷	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
13:55–56; 14:3–5	3	1 (+ 2?)	3/4 (75%) (5/6?)	2 × O 1 × SUB	1 × O (+ 2?)

An omission in 14: 4 is certain although the exact reading cannot be established. The substitution is in 13: 55 where 𝔓¹⁰³ is now the earliest witness to Ιωσής (with K L W Δ 0106 *f*¹³ 565 1241 *pm* k q^c sa bo^mss) instead of Ιωσήφ (cf. Mark 6: 3).

An additional omission of εἰσιν in 13: 56 (not in NA²⁷) has been corrected, probably by a second hand. However, the additional spaces referred to above (recto, l. 5, 8) imply that there were two further differences from NA²⁷ (additions/substitutions), that would likely be singular readings, that is, a total of five differences in six variation-units. In conclusion, it is best to categorize the textual quality as "at least normal" and the transmission character as "very free".

62 David C. Parker in Thomas, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXIV*, 7. At this point, Min's transcription is erroneous, probably because of a typographical error (*Überlieferung*, 224).

63 Min, *Überlieferung*, 229.

64 Other possible reconstructions mentioned by Min, *Überlieferung*, 228, are unattested and less probable. He further states that the omission of a word, regardless of which, points to the carelessness of the scribe, but in fact the most probable omission of αὐτῷ may already have been in the exemplar.

𝔓104 (Oxford, Sackler Library, P.Oxy. 4404)

A small fragment of a codex written in a reformed documentary hand.

Notes on transcription

Although the verso is extremely difficult to read, it probably contains 21: 45, which means that v. 44 has been omitted.[65]

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA[27]	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
21:34–7, 43, 45(?)	3	–	1/3 (33.3%)	1 × O	–

The omission of 21: 44 is also attested in D 33 it sy[s] Or Eus[syr] and the verse was printed in square brackets in NA[27] even before this papyrus was published. Min and Barbara Aland regard the short text as original and argue that v. 44 was inserted from Luke 20: 18; Aland refers to the omission as "a real Western non interpolation".[66]

In any case, the omission was probably in the exemplar and, although the sample is small, the data point to a "strict" transmission. Since Min thinks the omission is original he categorizes the textual quality as 'strict'. Given the partial nature of the evidence, including the very presence of the omission, I prefer the category "at least normal".

𝔓110 (Oxford, Sackler Library, P.Oxy. 4494)

A small fragment of a codex written in a reformed documentary hand or possibly literary book hand.

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA[27]	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
10:13–15, 25–7	7	6	11/13 (84.6%)	2 × A 3 × O 1 W/O 5 × SUB	1 × O 1 W/O 4 × SUB

[65] Note the caution of Thomas, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXIV*, 9. Head's investigation supports Thomas's reconstruction ('NT Papyri', 10 n. 18).

[66] Min, *Überlieferung*, 237–9, with notes (Aland's cited work has not appeared).

An additional substitution and correction not noted by Min was possibly made in scribendo in 10: 25 (*Βεελσεβουλ >Βεελζεβουλ*); it is excluded from the analysis. There are two other corrections towards the printed NA^{27} text. Two substitutions and two additions could be explained as harmonizations to the context or to parallels.[67] None of the variant readings alter the meaning of the text in any signficant way.

There are as many as six singular readings (one corrected), and two sub-singular readings. Barbara Aland and Min attribute all singular readings and some other readings to the carelessness of the scribe, rather than an idiosyncratic exemplar.[68] The large number of differences, including many singular readings, does point to a careless scribe. However, I think Min's strong differentiation between the 'strict' textual quality and the 'very free' character of transmission is overconfident.[69] I prefer to categorize 𝔓^{110} as an 'at least normal' text with a 'very free' character of transmission.

0171 (Berlin, Staatl. Mus., P.11863)

A fragment of a folio from a parchment codex written in a reformed documentary hand or possibly literary book hand.[70]

Notes on transcription

Recto, col. 2, ll. 27–30: Although some letters are uncertain, 0171 most likely attests to the major addition in 10: 23: *ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῇ ἄλλη ἐκδιώξουσιν ὑμᾶς φεύγετε ἐις τὴν ἄλλην*, extant in similar forms in D L *Θ* f^{13} 565 *pc* it vg^{mss} sy^{s} Or^{pt}.

Textual analysis

Text	Var.-units in NA^{27}	Extra var. -units	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
10:17–23, 25–32	9	3	8/12 (84.6%)	1 × A 1 × O 6 × SUB	1 × O 3 × SUB

Notably, five substitutions are modifications of verb forms. Four of the substitutions are shared with D only. It has been proposed that 0171 belongs

[67] See Min, *Überlieferung*, 250. [68] Ibid. 243–51; B. Aland, 'Kriterien', 3.

[69] Aland only categorizes the papyrus in terms of transmission character and concludes that it reflects a 'free transmission character' ('Kriterien', 12).

[70] Two further fragments of a folio containing Luke are not treated here.

to the 'Western' text (or the '*D*' *text group*).[71] However, Min argues convincingly that 0171 and D are not closely related, although they do share a harmonistic tendency.[72] There may be as many as six harmonizations (mostly to parallels), three of which are singular readings.[73] The major addition in 10: 23 is not a harmonization, but neither is it uniquely 'Western'.

In conclusion, Min's categorization of the textual quality of 0171 as 'normal' and the transmission character as 'free' is warranted.[74] The liberty of this scribe does not primarily reflect careless copying, but rather a tendency to harmonize and paraphrase.

THE EARLY TEXT OF MATTHEW

According to this analysis, the early witnesses to the Gospel of Matthew represent various points along a spectrum from the 'strict' textual quality ($\mathfrak{P}^{1}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{70}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{77}$), copied from exemplars with a text close to the reconstructed initial text in NA^{27}, to the 'normal' text ($\mathfrak{P}^{37}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, 0171) farther removed from the initial text. A few brief MSS are more difficult to evaluate, but their text can be categorized as 'at least normal' ($\mathfrak{P}^{101}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{103}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{110}$), whereas $\mathfrak{P}^{102}$ is too fragmentary to evaluate. In regard to transmission character, that is, how accurately the scribe copied the exemplar, there is likewise a spectrum from a 'strict' transmission ($\mathfrak{P}^{1}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$), via 'normal' ($\mathfrak{P}^{53}$) to 'free' ($\mathfrak{P}^{37}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{70}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{77}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{101}$, 0171) or 'very free' ($\mathfrak{P}^{103}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{110}$).

Out of 126 deviating readings in total, there are 17 additions, 41 omissions, 13 transpositions, and 55 substitutions. Out of 55 singular readings in total, there are 5 additions, 16 omissions, 6 transpositions, and 28 substitutions. Hence, substitutions and omissions are far more common than additions and transpositions. These results are in line with Royse's analysis of singular readings in the six large papyri.[75] They confirm that the traditional criterion to prefer the shorter reading (*lectio brevior potior*) is inapplicable to the early papyri.[76]

It is evident from this survey that relatively many of these early scribes made a lot of mistakes and took some liberties in their copying. At the same time, the

[71] See e.g. E. J. Epp, 'The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission', in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993): 293–5.

[72] Min, *Überlieferung*, 267–9. [73] Ibid. 264–5. [74] Ibid. 270.

[75] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 902. [76] Ibid. 705–36.

scribes seldom changed the meaning of the text.[77] In a forthcoming analysis, Scott Charlesworth comes to a similar conclusion.[78] He applies an alternative method to survey the textual fluidity of the Gospels by examining passages where the earliest witnesses overlap. In Matthew, he compares $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$ (26: 19–28) and $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$ (26: 29–40), and attempts to detect scribal intervention, whether intentional or unintentional, by applying the generally accepted principles of textual criticism at every point of divergence. Charlesworth concludes that 'the gospel text is transmitted across 100 or more years without any change in meaning', although 'a certain amount of limited fluidity in transmission was apparently acceptable'.[79]

Nevertheless, some scribes evidently copied the text of Matthew with great care, as reflected in the 'strict' text and transmission of $\mathfrak{P}^{1}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$, and perhaps $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$ with very few deviating readings. I have argued elsewhere that the 'strict' text represents a pure line of transmission from the earliest time, in contrast to some scholars, who think it represents an attempt to establish a controlled text at the end of the second century after the text had developed freely.[80]

One reason that the 'strict' text could survive in spite of a free attitude to copying on the part of some scribes may be that good, standard copies with a 'strict' text were widely available to the scribes.[81] That would also explain other standardized phenomena, such as the codex format, the titles of the Gospels, the use of *nomina sacra*, and various reading aids. Scott Charlesworth has suggested that some specific features are more common in MSS produced in controlled settings and intended for public reading than in copies for private use produced in settings where quality controls were mostly lacking.[82] He mentions the following features as conventional Christian approaches to MS production: uniformity in size, hands in the semi-literary to biblical majuscule

[77] Barbara Aland observes three main categories of error in the early papyri: negligence in copying; stylistic smoothing by minimal interference; and, more seldom, content change in order to make the meaning more clear ('Münsteraner Arbeit', 61); cf. Min, *Überlieferung*, 282–3.

[78] S. Charlesworth, *Early Christian Gospels* (Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, forthcoming).

[79] Ibid. Michael Mees reached the same conclusion in an earlier but less systematic examination of papyri in Matt. 26: 20–40. See Michael Mees, 'Die Bezeugung von Mt. 26, 20–40 auf Papyrus ($\mathfrak{P}^{64}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$) und ihre Bedeutung', *Aug* 11 (1971): 409–31, esp. 430–1.

[80] Wasserman, 'Implications of Textual Criticism'. Cf. H. Koester, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 37; W. L. Petersen, 'The Genesis of the Gospels', in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, 33–4 (esp. n. 4); D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 63, 200.

[81] Min, *Überlieferung*, 279; cf. C. H. Roberts, 'Books in the Graeco-Roman World and in the New Testament', in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, i. *From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: CUP, 1970), 48–66.

[82] Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 149. Cf. Larry Hurtado, 'The New Testament in the Second Century: Text, Collection and Canon', in J. W. Childers and D. C. Parker, eds., *Transmission and Reception* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006), 9–13.

range, the use of text division and/or punctuation, and various other lectional aids.[83]

Significantly, the MSS with the best text in our analysis, $\mathfrak{P}^{1}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$, bear several characteristics of a controlled production. The reconstructed sizes of $\mathfrak{P}^{1}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$ are *c*.13–15 × 23–5 cm (Turner's Group 8).[84] Codices $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$ are of earlier date (*c*.200; second century) and typically more compact, *c*.13 × 18 cm (Turner's Group 9.1).[85] $\mathfrak{P}^{1}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$ are written in a reformed documentary hand and have reading aids in varying degree.[86] $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$ stands in a class of its own, written in two columns in a literary book hand with lectional aids.[87]

On the other side of the spectrum we find $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$ of 'normal' textual quality, and 'free' transmission character. The many differences from the initial text include as many as thirteen singular readings and a long omission due to haplography (26: 49–50). The size is admittedly typical for the third–fourth centuries (about 15 × 25 cm) and there are lectional aids, but the hand is undoubtedly documentary and very unsuitable for public reading. The Manuscript gives every impression of having been written in haste.[88]

However, there are some MSS in this analysis that do not allow a clear distinction between a controlled and uncontrolled production, in particular $\mathfrak{P}^{110}$ and 0171 with 'at least normal'/'normal' text and 'very free'/'free' transmission. They are of varying size (11 × 20 cm; 11 × 15 cm), but contain reading aids and are written in a reformed documentary hand, or possibly even literary book hand. There is a significant difference between them: the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{110}$ seems to have had a good exemplar, but copied rather carelessly, whereas the scribe of 0171 had a normal exemplar but copied with somewhat more care. In conclusion, the data suggest that one can expect the best MSS to bear the

[83] Ibid. 149–52, 157.

[84] E. G. Turner, *The Typology of the Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 23, states that '[w]hen the relationship between breadth and height is also found to be constant (as it is in Group 8, where B = 1/2 H), the grouping may confidently be taken to embody the intentions of the original makers of the books in question. In such cases . . . the factor of proportion between breadth and height retains its importance.'

[85] Turner regards this subclass (Group 9, aberrant 1), 'in which B:H roughly corresponds to 2:3 as competing with Group 8 for the distinction of being the earliest format of the papyrus codex' (ibid. 25). His judgment is confirmed by Charlesworth's overview of NT papyrus codices, where Group 9.1 is preponderant in the 2nd or 2nd/3rd centuries ('Public and Private', 155, table 1).

[86] With reservation for $\mathfrak{P}^{35}$ which Cavallo describes as 'Alexandrian majuscule' (see above).

[87] Cf. C. H. Roberts: 'In the first, no. 8 [$\mathfrak{P}^{4}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$], the text is divided into sections on a system also found in the Bodmer codex of Luke and John that recurs in some of the great fourth-century codices and was clearly not personal to this scribe. . . . In its handsome script as well as in its organization—there are three different positions for punctuation as well as omission and quotation signs—it is a thoroughgoing literary production.' See C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: OUP, 1979), 23.

[88] Cf. Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 161–3.

characteristics of a controlled production, whereas other MSS may or may not bear such characteristics.[89]

Larry Hurtado regards the scribal conventions and examples of careful copying as signs of an emergent Christian 'material culture' and a distinctive Christian literary ethos.[90] He further points out that the public reading of fixed lessons would have set limits to the extent of textual change that could be tolerated in a given circle. Hurtado's observation implies that in the public setting there was continuous control on the text beyond the stage of manuscript production. This is indirectly confirmed by an episode told by Augustine in a letter to Jerome (*Ep*. 71A, 3.5) when Jerome's new translation (the Vulgate) of Jonah was liturgically read to a congregation at Oea. Apparently, a tumult broke out because of one single word in Jonah 4: 6 that differed 'from that which had long been familiar to the senses and memory of all the worshippers and had been read for so many generations in the church', so the bishop in charge was compelled to revert to the Old Latin rendering.[91] Although this incident took place at the beginning of the fifth century, the public reading of scripture, with its roots in the Jewish synagogue service, had been practiced in the church from its earliest times (cf. 1 Thess. 5: 27; Col. 4: 16).

Unfortunately, only a fraction of manuscripts from the earliest era of the New Testament textual transmission has survived. Eldon J. Epp has pointed out that '[i]f we had several pieces of evidence like the $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$B relationship [i.e., a 'strict' text], it would be plausible to argue that the situation [the state of the text] was not chaotic, but quite orderly'.[92] I would argue that the body of evidence pointing in this direction is growing. Recently, Epp has confirmed that the earliest extant fragments from the second century, $\mathfrak{P}^{52}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{90}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{98}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$, attest to a 'close continuity' between 'the earliest, most obscure phase, and the later more ample phases of the textual transmission', such as is unusual to find in ancient text transmission.[93]

If more evidence were available, we would be able to observe that textual corruption happened in smaller steps than might be assumed. Even the early

[89] Ibid. 172: 'because trained copyists could still be involved [in a private setting], it is not possible to equate strictly the public/controlled and private/uncontrolled categories with professional/trained scribes and untrained copyists, respectively'.

[90] Hurtado, 'The New Testament', 12–13.

[91] See Harry Gamble, 'Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping of the New Testament Canon', in C. Horton, ed., *The Earliest Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 37–8 (including English tr.).

[92] Epp, 'A Dynamic View', 93.

[93] E. J. Epp, 'Are Early New Testament Manuscripts Truly Abundant?', in D. B. Capes *et al.*, eds., *Israel's God and Rebecca's Children* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2008), 105. Epp concludes by stating: 'What these remnants [the few early NT MSS] lack in amplitude is made up by their provision of connection and continuity, and in that sense the New Testament manuscripts still may be understood as genuinely abundant' (ibid. 107). Cf. Hurtado, 'The New Testament', 7.

scribes would normally copy the exemplar with fidelity. When other readings were introduced they normally came from another manuscript, resulting in contamination. Thus, nearly all MSS in the textual tradition have close relatives, whether they are still extant or not.[94] The Alands speak of a 'tenacity' in the New Testament textual tradition, which means that once a reading occurred, it would be stubbornly preserved in the tradition.[95] It will never be possible, because of the universal presence of contamination, to reconstruct a stemma of MSS, as in a historical-documentary method, but I think there is a sufficient degree of coherence in the textual tradition to allow the tracing of the genealogical relationship between the readings and texts that MSS carry, and, by extension, to reconstruct the initial text of the New Testament.

[94] In this connection, it is interesting to note the close relationship of $\mathfrak{P}^{37}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ in spite of their 'free' transmission character.

[95] Aland and Aland, *The Text*, 291–2.

6

The Early Text of Mark

Peter M. Head

INTRODUCTION

Our manuscript resources for the early text of Mark are relatively thin, especially in comparison with the other canonical gospels and most other NT books. In the period which we might legitimately classify as 'early'—that is, pre-Constantinian, or earlier than the great uncials which emerged in the fourth century—we have only a single papyrus manuscript in Greek, and that manuscript, 𝔓[45] (P. Chester Beatty Biblical I) is, as we shall see, rather poorly preserved.

The paucity of manuscripts, alongside the relative absence of information about the text of Mark in the early period, is something that distinguishes the text of Mark from that of the other three canonical gospels, which we shall explore in what follows. We shall obviously want to interrogate our single early witness, as well as the manuscript resources of the fourth century, on which our knowledge of the text of Mark ultimately depends. From the fourth century onwards we also have manuscript witnesses to the translations of Mark into Latin, Syriac, and Coptic that were certainly made in the 'early' period and inform us about the transmission of the text of Mark in that period, even though the actual manuscript evidence is later (some of it considerably so). References to Mark and quotations from Mark in Christian writers of the second and third centuries are also relatively uncommon (unlike the manuscripts this situation does not improve significantly in later centuries), although we shall offer a brief survey of these as well in what follows.

It has sometimes been suggested that the text of Mark is relatively less secure than the other canonical gospels.[1] It is the case that there are textual problems at the beginning and ending of the Gospel, as well as numerous

[1] E.g. recently J. Dewey alleged that Mark had more textual variants than the other Gospels, 'The Survival of Mark's Gospel: A Good Story?', *JBL* 123 (2004): 505.

other passages where significant disagreement remains among textual scholars.[2] In a comparison of seven modern editions of the Greek New Testament, Mark's text has fewer identical text verses than any other NT document (and was the only NT document where fewer than half the verses were printed in exactly the same form in all seven editions).[3] This suggests, as Dewey noted, 'Scholars have had greater difficulty in agreeing on the Markan text' (when compared with the other Gospels).[4] Substantiating a differential between Mark and the other Gospels on the basis of a greater number of variant readings in the manuscripts does not seem possible at the current time, and would in any case, distract us from our main task here: to trace the evidence we do have for knowledge of the text of Mark in the second- and early third-century church writers before looking at the earliest manuscript evidence in the third and fourth centuries.

MARK IN THE EARLY CHURCH

We don't know much for certain about the publication and earliest distribution of Mark's Gospel. The parallels across the triple tradition, the plausibility with which differences can be attributed to the redactional tendencies of Matthew and Luke, and the way in which their narratives diverge most strongly when Mark is lacking (i.e. in the birth and resurrection narratives),

[2] In the *textus receptus* Mark was published with 678 verses (Erasmus 1516; Stephanus 1551), whereas in modern critical Greek texts there are generally 661 verses (verses omitted: 7: 16; 9: 44, 46; 11: 26; 15: 28; 16: 9–20; in addition to these Gould suggests that were approximately 650 variations from TR in the critical edns. of his day; E. P. Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896, 1921 repr.), p. li). Ongoing debate exists on a number of passages. NA^{27} has 50 sections of Mark within single square brackets, reflecting editorial doubt. B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994; 2nd edn.) discusses 144 passages in Mark. J. K. Elliott argues that NA^{27}/UBSGNT fails because of an 'excessive respect for the readings of the so-called great uncials (especially א B) and a cavalier attitude towards principles based on internal evidence', 'An Eclectic Textual Commentary on the Greek Text of Mark's Gospel' repr. in J. K. Elliott, *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), 190 (Elliott discusses 1: 4: *ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*; 1.27: *τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὕτη; ὅτι και ἐξουσίαν, και*; 1: 41: *ὀργισθείς*; 5.22: omit *ὀνόματι Ἰάϊρος*; 6.3: *τοῦ τέκτονος υἱὸς καί*; 6.22: *θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρῳδιάδος*; 6.41: *μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ*; 9.38: *ὅς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν*; 10.2: omit προσελθόντες (οἱ) *Φαρισαῖοι*; 11.24: *λαμβάνετε*). H. Greeven and E. Güting, eds., *Textkritik des Markusevangeliums* (Münster: Lit, 2005) discuss 420 variation units in Mark.

[3] K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 29–30. They collated the text of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, von Soden, Vogels, Merk, Bover and Nestle-Aland 25th edn.: Mark had only 306 verses without any textual difference between the seven editions. (45.1% of verses).

[4] Dewey, 'Survival of Mark's Gospel', 505–6.

suggests strongly that the Gospel of Mark was known and used as source material by both Matthew and Luke. It is also quite likely that the author of the Fourth Gospel knew Mark as this Gospel presumes some acquaintance with Markan traditions on the part of his readers. Bauckham has argued that two parenthetical remarks relate John's chronological sequence to that of Mark (3: 24) and identify by name an unnamed character in Mark (John 11: 2).[5]

The combined evidence for the use of and knowledge of Mark on the part of the other canonical evangelists suggests an early and widespread knowledge and respect for Mark as a written text and a resource for information about Jesus; at the same time it signals the desire of others to improve and supplement the Markan record. A gospel text attributed to Mark was also known to Papias, a church leader in Hierapolis (Asia Minor) in the first half of the second century (according to excerpts cited in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.39.15). Papias provides the first statement of a connection between Mark and Peter, which was repeated and developed in later writers.[6] Elsewhere in the same period there is no strong evidence for the knowledge and/or use of Mark in any of the so-called Apostolic Fathers. The Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology found no trace whatsoever of Mark in *Barnabas*, *Didache, 1 Clement*, Polycarp and *2 Clement*.[7] Two examples of parallel phrasing, or 'very doubtful allusions', were found in Ignatius (*Eph*. 16.2 // Mark 9: 43; *Smyrn*. 10.2 // Mark 8: 38), but do not demonstrate knowledge of Mark. Hermas provides the best evidence, but this amounts to a single close parallel to some uniquely Markan material (Hermas, *Mand*. 4.2.1 // Mark 6: 52), along with other parallels to material from the synoptic triple tradition, some of which could have come from Mark. This may be an echo of Mark, but it does not constitute strong evidence that Hermas knew the text of Mark and even less evidence for the use, reception, and interpretation of Mark.

Textual evidence suggests that the original ending of Mark was found to be less than satisfactory in some circles and a new ending (the Long Ending, Mark 16: 9–20) was produced in the second century, although the date and location cannot be determined. Drawing on material from Matthew, Luke, and John this additional ending served to authenticate some aspects of the ongoing missionary activity of the church, especially in providing support for itinerant Christian preachers—clearly, the Gospel was perceived to be valuable enough to warrant this improvement in order to meet the needs of present and future generations.[8] Both forms of Mark continued to circulate until at least the

[5] R. J. Bauckham, 'John for Readers of Mark', in R. Bauckham, ed., *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 147–71.

[6] Cf. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 106.9f (noted below); Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3.1.1; Clement of Alexandria, acc. Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 6.14.5–7; Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 4.5.3.

[7] *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905).

[8] J. A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000), 155.

fourth century (early translations also display a variety at this point), after which the longer form became the dominant textual form of Mark.

In the middle of the second century the Gospel according to Mark was known to Justin as the memoir of Peter (*Dial.* 106.3 must be Mark because of two items exclusively present in Mark 3: 16–17). The 'memoirs' referred to by Justin in this portion of the *Dialogue* are clearly written Gospels (note the phrase 'it is written' used in their connection in *Dial.* 103.6, 8; 104.1; 105.6; 106.3; 107.1). In the immediate context Justin also alludes to both Luke and Matthew (*Dial.* 106).

The harmonistic tendency evident in the Long Ending suggests that Mark was not interpreted in isolation from the other Gospels so much as in connection with the witness of the other three. This longer form was used by Tatian in his Diatessaron and cited by Irenaeus in his discussion of the four-Gospel canon.[9] Although we lack early manuscripts of Mark, we can ascertain some features of the transmission in the second century from variant readings attested in Irenaeus, Origen, and later manuscripts. The twin forces of 'improvements' to the text, whether historical or theological (e.g. at 1: 1, 2; 6: 3), and harmonization to render the text more compatible with the other Gospels (e.g. Mark 1: 41; 15: 28), both exerted some force.[10] Linton traced a large number of textual improvements to Mark which reflected an 'intention to produce a clear and reasonable text, in which the most evident offences against Greek style and grammar were eliminated'.[11]

Some evidence for the knowledge and use of Mark among Gnostic and other groups around the middle of the second century is found in Irenaeus. He refers to Valentinians citing Mark 5: 31: 'who touched me?' (*Adv. Haer.* 1.3.3) and also Mark 10: 38: 'Can ye be baptized with the baptism which I shall be baptized with?' (*Adv. Haer.* 1.21.2). Irenaeus also states that Mark's Gospel was preferred by 'those who separate Jesus from Christ, alleging that Christ remained impassible, but that it was Jesus who suffered' (*Adv. Haer.* 3.11.7)—presumably a form of adoptionism.

Irenaeus himself correlates Mark's Gospel closely with the other three as one of the Four. These Gospels he identifies as those according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John and provides some traditional information on each author (*Adv. Haer.* 3.1.1, also quoted later in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.8.2–4). While this becomes the dominant theoretical view from the

[9] Justin may have known the Long Ending (*Apol.* 1.45), although even if he did he may not have known it as the ending of Mark. Irenaeus definitely cites from the Long Ending as the end of the text of Mark's Gospel (*Adv. Haer.* 3.10.5 f).

[10] Cf. P. M. Head, 'A Text-Critical Study of Mark 1.1: "The Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" ', *NTS* 37 (1991): 621–9 (for one example); B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford: OUP, 1993), *passim* (see index to 20 passages in Mark on p. 303).

[11] O. Linton, 'Evidences of a Second-Century Revised Edition of St Mark's Gospel', *NTS* 14 (1968): 321–355 (although he has not established that all the improvements come from a single reviser).

end of the second century (as also in Tatian's Diatessaron, in Tertullian's thought—e.g. *Adv. Marc*. 4.2—and presumed in the Muratorian Canon),[12] we should note that knowledge of the contents of Mark's Gospel seems to have been limited. Although Irenaeus quotes extensively from New Testament writings, and has some 626 quotations from the Gospels,[13] he explicitly quotes only three passages as from Mark; and on one occasion cites Matthew 11: 27 // Luke 10: 22 and writes 'thus has Matthew set it down, and Luke similarly, and also Mark; for John omits this passage'.[14] This is more likely to be ignorance of the Markan content than an otherwise unknown textual form of Mark. We could say something similar about Origen. In the introduction to his commentary on Matthew he wrote that he had 'learnt by tradition concerning the four Gospels, which alone are unquestionable in the Church of God under heaven': Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John (as cited in Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist*. 6.25.4). On two occasions Origen makes comments which may suggest he was not well acquainted with Mark. First, in *Contra Celsum* Origen writes in response to a comment of Celsus about Jesus following the trade of a carpenter, that 'in none of the Gospels current in the Churches is Jesus Himself ever described as being a carpenter' (6.36); this may either reflect knowledge of a text of Mark which read 6: 3 as 'Is not this the carpenter's son, the son of Mary?' or, as Metzger suggests, it may be 'more probable that his denial rests upon a lapse of memory, for he was apparently less well acquainted with the Gospel of Mark than with the other Gospels'.[15] The second example occurs in a discussion of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew and Luke. Origen states: 'We have also searched Mark for some such similar prayer that might have escaped our notice, but we have found no trace of one' (*de Orat*. 18.3).

The works of Clement of Alexandria (*c*.150–215) contain a large number of citations from the Gospels (something around 700 citations from Matthew, 400 from both Luke and John).[16] But he gives only one citation from Mark, an extensive, unusual and somewhat harmonized version (*Quis dives salvetur* 4:

[12] Tatian's Diatessaron, by its very name speaks of the creation of a harmony from the four separate gospels, W. L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

[13] For Irenaeus citations see J. Hoh, *Die Lehre des heiligen Irenäus über das Neue Testament* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1919), 189–97.

[14] *Adv. Haer*. 3.10.5: cites Mark 1: 1 and 16: 19. *Adv. Haer*. 4.6.1 cites Matt. 11: 27 // Luke 10: 22 as from Mark. For other references to Mark (not explicitly attributed), see Mark 1: 24 (*AH* 4.6.6; could be Luke 4: 34, adjacent to another citation from Luke 4//Matt. 4); 5.31 (*AH* 1.3.3); 5: 41, 43 (*AH* 5.13.1); 8: 31 (*AH* 3.16.5: not specific to Mark, and possibly just general reminiscence, since it doesn't correspond exactly to any one text); 9: 23 (*AH* 4.37.5); 9: 44 (*AH* 2.32.1); 10: 38 (*AH* 1.21.3); 13: 32 (*AH* 2.28.6); 16: 19 (*AH* 3.10.6), cf. H. B. Swete, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 3rd edn. (London: Macmillan, 1909), p. xxxii.

[15] B. M. Metzger, 'Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts', in *Historical and Literary Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 101.

[16] M. Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testmaent bei Clemens von Alexandrien* (Bari: Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, Universita di Bari, 1970); C. P. Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2008).

4–10).[17] Scholars have differed over whether this is a free type of quotation or a quotation from a free type of text.[18] Whichever of these it is, and I favour the latter, the single citation from Mark compared to hundreds of citations from the other Gospels confirms the general picture that, even when Mark was known, it was not apparently extensively used.

Although Mark is mentioned by many later church fathers, the paucity of homilies and commentaries on Mark in the patristic era is notable. The earliest commentary is a fifth-century work attributed to Victor of Antioch who stated in the preface that he had 'arranged in an orderly commentary the scattered explanations of Mark by the teachers of the church'.[19] An unidentified seventh-century figure wrote the first 'proper' commentary on Mark; he noted: 'It seems to me that the reason why Gospel commentators have completely neglected Mark is because he tells much the same story as Matthew does.'[20]

The relative neglect of Mark among the early church fathers corresponds to the general proportions of manuscripts in the early period. The early manuscripts of the Gospels reflect a marked predominance for Matthew and John (among material on papyrus: 27 include John; 25 include Matthew; 10 include Luke; and only 3 include Mark).[21] It is unlikely that this reflects random distribution for (at least) two reasons—first, this corresponds very closely to the popularity of the respective Gospels in the early church, inasmuch as this can be determined from the evidence of the citations of the Gospels in the church fathers. The citation preference throughout in writers of the second and third centuries involves a clear ranking of the Gospels in the early church in the order: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, which generally matches the ratio we have in early papyrus manuscripts.[22] Secondly, the ratio of fragmentary gospel manuscripts changes dramatically in the later period—the proportions of

[17] Cosaert discusses only two other citations from Mark: Mark 8: 38 in *Strom*. 4.70.2; and an echo of Mark 9: 29 in *Ecl*. 15.1 (*The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria*, 118–19).

[18] Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria*, 120 n. 63; B. Aland, 'The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History', in C. Horton, ed., *The Earliest Gospels* (London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 108–21, esp. 119–20.

[19] M. Cahill, 'The First Markan Commentary', *RB* 101 (1994), 266.

[20] Ibid. 264. PsJerome, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Marcum* (PL 30: 589–644); M. Cahill, *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation* (New York: OUP, 1997).

[21] K. Aland *et al*., eds., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), with supplements. In a list of 'Christian Literary Texts in Manuscripts of the Second and Third Centuries' L.W. Hurtado has 13 of Matthew, 1 of Mark, 7 of Luke, and 16 of John, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 217–20.

[22] From the listings citations in *Biblica Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique* (3 vols. Paris: CNRS, 1975, 1977, 1980) we can determine the following. Vol. i, which deals with the period up until Clement and Tertullian (and including non-canonical material from all periods), has 70 pages for Matthew (223–93); 26 pages for Mark (293–319); 59 pages for Luke (319–78); and 36 pages for John. Vol. ii, which deals with the 3rd cent. apart from Origen, has 64 pages for Matthew (235–99); 5 pages for Mark (299–304); 18 pages for Luke (304–22); and 31 pages for John (322–53). The figures for Origen (vol. iii) are 57 pages for Matthew (224–81); 5 pages for Mark (281–6); 23 pages for Luke (286–309); and 38 pages for John (309–47).

gospel material preserved fragmentarily among extant majuscule manuscripts is as follows: Matthew 30; Mark 22; Luke 19; John 22; corresponding much more closely to what might be expected given the expectation (supported on the basis of the fuller extant manuscripts) that the Gospels were transmitted predominantly within the four-Gospel codex format in this later period.[23]

P. CHESTER BEATTY I (𝔓[45])

P. Chester Beatty I (𝔓[45]) contains portions of all four Gospels and Acts and so will feature in a number of other chapters. In none of them will it be so isolated and also so important, as the only pre-fourth-century manuscript of the relevant text.[24] Portions of six leaves of Mark are extant (designated as folios 3–8), providing parts of the following passages: Mark 4: 36–40; 5: 15–26; 5: 38–6: 3, 16–25, 36–50; 7: 3–15; 7: 25–8: 1, 10–26; 8: 34–9: 9, 18–31; 11: 27–12: 1, 5–8, 13–19, 24–8. This list is a little maximalist, since some of these are very fragmentary. For example, folio 3 preserves only one or two complete words from each of the verses listed (4: 36–40 and 5: 15–26). Despite this, the presence of almost complete pages, including pagination, in some of the other Gospels, enables a general reconstruction of the amount of text in the codex as a whole.[25] In Skeat's reconstruction Mark was the fourth Gospel, occupying around thirty-two pages of text between Luke and Acts.[26] With six extant leaves of Mark it is possible to count from equivalent points on each side of a leaf, giving a full page of text between the two points. Since we know the general shape of the page from the almost complete leaves of Luke, and can confirm the amount of space in the manuscript prior to the paginated leaves, it is clear that the original text of Mark in 𝔓[45] was generally the same as the text represented by Sinaiticus and Vaticanus a century later (it is this text, rather than that of 𝔓[45] which is present in NA^{27}).[27]

[23] These numbers are calculated on the basis of the fragmentary majuscule material (consisting of less than or equal to two pages in total) listed in Aland *et al., Kurzgefasste Liste* 1994 (with supplements).

[24] F. G. Kenyon's judgement, 'the third century, and the first half of it rather than the second' (*The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, ii. *The Gospels and Acts*, 1. *Text* (London: E. Walker, 1933), p. x) has been generally accepted.

[25] Pagination survives on two pages: 193 (Acts 14: 15–23), 199 (Acts 17: 9–17); leaves 11 and 12 (Luke 10: 6–11: 46) and leaves 13 and 14 (Luke 11: 50–13: 24) form successive conjoint pairs. These are the basis for T. C. Skeat, 'A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus Codex of the Gospels and Acts (𝔓[45])', *Herm* 155 (1993): 27–43.

[26] The order Matthew, John, Luke, Mark is also found in D (Bezae), W, old Latin MSS, Gothic, etc. (cf. D. C. Parker, *Codex Bezae* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 116–18).

[27] e.g. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, ii/1, pp. xix–xx. 𝔓[45] has in some respects made little impact on the published edition. of Mark in NA^{27}. ℵ and B in combination almost

Two features of the text of Mark in 𝔓45 are worth mentioning here. First the original scribal text of the Gospel was carefully, but relatively sparsely punctuated, as throughout the manuscript. Secondly, a secondary system of marking up the text for reading has been added fairly consistently through the Markan part of the manuscript (but not in the other Gospels). Although the writing is very small and compact these markings and the careful punctuation suggest that the manuscript may have been used in public reading. It would be wrong, in my opinion, to exclude this purely on the basis of the size of the writing.

In relation to the wording of the text of Mark attested by 𝔓45 it is clear that for Mark in particular the text of 𝔓45 stands closest to that of W—the relation of the text of Mark to the other major witnesses is quite different from the other Gospels, suggesting that the exemplar of Mark may have been somewhat distinct from those of the other Gospels.[28] The peculiar relation of P45 and W also demonstrates at least for the period after 𝔓45 that this type of text was transmitted fairly carefully at least up to the point of Codex Washington.[29]

Colwell argued, and this has recently been reinforced by Royse, on the basis of the number of singular readings throughout 𝔓45 that reflect a somewhat paraphrastic tendency, that the scribe copied 'phrase by phrase', rendering the ideas and thoughts of the text rather than the particular words, and exercising considerable freedom on points of detail. Colwell said: 'This scribe does not actually copy words. He sees through the language to its idea-content, and copies that—often in words of his own choosing, or in words rearranged as to order.'[30] Royse notes that of 227 singular readings, 218 (or 96%) make sense

always trump a 𝔓45 reading with only four exceptions, where 𝔓45 has substantial additional support: at 6: 41 read *αυτου* (𝔓45 with A D W *Θ* Maj.); at 7: 28: read *κυριε και* (𝔓45 with W *Θ* f13); at 7: 35: read *ευθεως*; (𝔓45 with A W *Θ* Maj. etc.); at 8: 34: read *ακολουθειν* (𝔓45 with C* D W *Θ* Maj.). Sometimes 𝔓45 joins with one of these two over against the other: in 6: 23 where NA27 follows 𝔓45 and B for *οτι* (changed from NA25); 6: 37 where NA27 follows 𝔓45 and B for *δωσομεν*; 6: 38 where NA27 follows 𝔓45 and ℵ for *αρτους εχετε* (changed from NA25); 6: 43 where NA27 follows 𝔓45 and B for *κλασματα δωδεκα κοφινων πληρωματα*; 7: 26 where NA27 follows 𝔓45 and ℵ for *συροφοινικισσα*; 8: 16 where NA27 follows 𝔓45 and B for *εχουσιν*; 8: 19 where NA27 follows 𝔓45 and B: no addition; 9: 2 where NA27 follows 𝔓45 and ℵ for *τον*.

[28] For this point cf. B. Aland, 'The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri', 113 (p. 114 n. 28: lists some significant agreements between 𝔓45 and W: Mark 6: 45 lack *εις το περαν*; 6: 48: add *σφοδρα και*; 8: 38: lack *λογους*; 8: 38: lack *ταυτη* 9: 2: add *εν τω προσευχεσθαι αυτους*; 9: 2: add *ο Ιησους*; 9: 25: lack *τω ακαθαρτω*; 9: 27: lack *και ανεστη*).

[29] Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, ii/1, p. xii. Some of Kenyon's reconstructions, and the attribution of 𝔓45 and W to a 'Caesarean' text are criticized by H. W. Huston, 'Mark 6 and 11 in 𝔓45 and in the Caesarean Text', *JBL* 64 (1955): 262–71. The relationship between 𝔓45 and W in Mark is demonstrated more fully in L. W. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981).

[30] E. C. Colwell, 'Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text', in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 106–24, here from p. 117.

Table 6.1. Early Papyrus Witnesses to Mark (3rd and 4th centuries)

Greg/Aland no.	*Editio princeps*	Date	Provenance	Size	Contents	Aland textual quality
𝔓45 (P. Chester Beatty I)	F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. II: The Gospels and Acts. 1. Text* (1933); *2. Plates* (1934).	III	Unknown[a]	25 × 20cm, one column, 39 lines per page	Mark 4:36–40; 5:15–26; 5:38–6:3, 16–25, 36–50; 7:3–15; 7:25–8:1, 10– 26; 8:34–9:9, 18–31; 11:27–12:1, 5–8, 13–19, 24–8 (also portions of Matt, John, Luke, Acts)	'Free text, category 1'[b]
𝔓88 (P. Med. Inv. Nr. 69.24)	S. Daris, 'Papiri letterari dell' Università Cattolica di Milano, 6. Marco, Vangelo 2, 1–26', *Aeg* 52 (1972), 80–8.	IV	Unknown	24 × 15cm, one column, 22 or 23 lines per page	Mark 2:1–26	Category III[c]

[a] C. Horton, 'The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: A Find of the Greatest Importance', in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels* (2004), 149–60.
[b] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 99.
[c] Ibid.

and read fairly smoothly. If we focus on the singular readings in Mark—of which Royse lists forty-nine—we note quite a range of types of readings, with numerous omissions (of clauses and single words), and nine harmonizations to synoptic parallels.[31]

FOURTH-CENTURY MANUSCRIPTS

There are three manuscripts of Mark dated to the fourth century: 𝔓[88], א and B. We shall treat the papyrus manuscript first (not because the relative date of this in relation to the other two is secured).

𝔓[88] (P. Med. Inv. Nr. 69.24) consists of a single sheet of papyrus which makes up the central bifolium of a quire; we thus have four pages (24 × 15 cm) of text containing Mark 2: 1–26 (vv. 1–8, 8–15, 15–19, 20–6) in a single column with 22 or 23 lines.[32] Given that the text in the portion that is extant is close to that of א and B (and hence NA[27]) it is possible to make a general estimate that since Mark 2: 1–26 takes up sixty-four lines of NA[27] text, each page of 𝔓[88] would correspond to around sixteen lines of NA[27] text. Mark 1: 1–45 takes up around ninety lines in NA[27], hence would take up six previous pages, and thus the beginning of Mark would correspond to the first page of an (expected) four-sheet quire. This is most easily compatible with an original codex beginning with Mark and perhaps comprising Mark alone (although a multi-gospel codex cannot be excluded).

In general, as already noted, the text is close to that of א and B; those variants that exist (mostly in the area of spelling and word order) are almost entirely in line with other representatives of that text. For example 𝔓[88] shares the spelling *κραβακτον* with only א at vv. 9, 11, 12 (this word is not extant in v. 4); it shares the word order *εγειρε σοι λεγω* in v. 11 only with א; and it shares the variant *οτι* for *τι* in v. 8 only with 579 (this could perhaps be classified as sub-singular since they do not share the same readings in surrounding words),

[31] J. R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 776–8 for the list. Note esp. Mark 8: 10 (Matt. 15: 39); Mark 8: 12a (cf. 1 Cor. 1: 22; Matt. 16: 4). On the tendency to omit Colwell noted 'The most striking aspect of his style is its conciseness. The dispensable word is dispensed with. He omits adverbs, adjectives, nouns, participles, verbs, personal pronouns—without any compensating habit of addition.' 'Scribal Habits in Early Papyri', *Studies in Methodology*, 118–19.

[32] S. Daris, 'Papiri letterari dell' Università Cattolica di Milano, 6. Marco, Vangelo 2, 1–26', *Aegyptus*, 52 (1972): 80–8. A photograph is provided, but the papyrus is badly damaged and many details are unclear, as exemplified by the number of underlying dots deployed in the editor's transcription (which we have followed, with the additional resource of the transcription at New Testament Transcripts Prototype—http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de/).

and the reading μεθ εαυτων in v. 19 with L (although A shares this reading in a different word order).[33] Singular readings consist of spelling variants (φαρεισεοι in vv. 16, 18 (bis), 24; the *nomen sacrum* ιω̅ in v. 15); and some errors, most of which are corrected: v. 10: εχε → εχει; v. 19: νυνται → δυνανται; v. 23: σποριων → σποριμων (the only uncorrected error is the reading ου in v. 25: ου μετ αυτου, which is a nonsense reading). The words οι δε σοι μαθηται ου νηστευουσιν are lacking in v. 18 (probably due to homoioteleuton).

Codex Vaticanus B/03 (Vaticanus Greek 1209), has been plausibly dated to the middle of the fourth century.[34] The Gospel of Mark is presented as one of the four Gospels, appearing after Matthew and before Luke and John, within a whole Greek Bible manuscript. The square pages with three columns per page and a regular forty-two lines per column, offer a distinctive presentation.[35] The text was corrected by a contemporary corrector (designated B¹ in NA²⁷; B² in Tisch.); and the neat lettering has been retraced in the tenth or eleventh century. The text of Mark has been described, using the traditional text-typing, as 'overwhelmingly Alexandrian'.[36] There is no dispute that the text of Mark printed in NA²⁷ relies overwhelmingly on this particular manuscript (especially when it agrees with Sinaiticus).

Most of the singular readings in Mark in Vaticanus consist of spelling peculiarities, many of which are carried through systematically, for example, *Ιωανης* (with a single *nu*), *Γαλειλαιας*, and *φαρεισαιοι*.[37] Other names with singular spelling are: *Σειδωνα* (3: 8 also 7: 24; and 7: 31 (with 𝔓⁴⁵)); *βεεζεβουλ* (3: 22); *Δαλμανουνθα* (8: 10); *Τειμαιου Βαρτειμαιος* (10: 46); *Βηδθαγη* (B* 11: 1); *Γετσημανει* (B* 14: 32) *Ζαβαφθανει* (15: 34); *Ιωση* (B* 15: 43; also 15: 45 (not sing.)). As can be seen already, the preference for spelling

[33] 𝔓⁸⁸ also reads αθεωνται (v. 5 with ℵ B C D); λευειν (v. 14 with ℵᶜ C); γεινεται (v. 15 with B* W and v. 21 with ℵ A B*); γραμματις (v. 16 with Θ); ησθιεν (v16 with ℵ D); χριαν (vv. 17 and 25 with ℵ L Θ); επιραπτι (v. 21 with ℵ and Δ); ελεγεν (v. 25 with B); δαυειδ (v. 25 with B D W); επινασεν (v. 25 with ℵ B).

[34] G. Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1967): 54–55 after 328 and before 360.

[35] The Gospels all feature chapter enumeration, with 62 sections numbered in Mark (H. K. McArthur, 'The Earliest Divisions of the Gospels', *Studia Evangelica*, iii/2, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin: Akademie, 1964), 266–72); these are 'not original to the manuscript but added already perhaps in the fourth or fifth century', S. Pisano, 'The Text of the New Testament', *Prolegomena to Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B* (1999): 27–41, from p. 27; cf. also T. C. Skeat, 'The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine', *JTS* 50 (1999): 600–1.

[36] S. Pisano, 'The Text of the New Testament', *Prolegomena to Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B* (1999): 35 (with occasional agreement with 'Caesarean' witnesses; e.g. at 1: 29: εξελθων ηλθεν; 1: 34: χριστον ειναι; 11: 17).

[37] *Ιωανης* (with a single *nu*): 1: 4, 6, 9, 14, 19; 2.18 (bis); 3: 17; 5: 37 (not sing.); 6: 14 (not sing.), 16, 17, 18, 20 (not sing.), 24, 25 (not sing.); 9: 2, 38; 10: 11, 35, 41; 11: 30, 32; 13: 3; 14.33. *Γαλειλαιας*: 1: 14 (B*), 16 (B*), 28; 3: 7 (not sing.); 6: 21; 7: 31; 9: 30; 14: 28. φαρεισαιοι: 2: 16, 18 (bis), 24; 3: 6; 7: 1, 3, 4 (with 𝔓⁴⁵); 8: 1 (with 𝔓⁴⁵), 15; 10: 2; 12: 13.

with -*ει*- is marked.[38] There are some minor errors,[39] some small omissions,[40] some word order variations,[41] preposition substitutions,[42] and verb form variations,[43] as well as some preference for certain forms (e.g. the reflexive pronoun and *καθ ιδιαν*).[44] Remarkably there are only a few minor additions,[45] and no additions of more than a single word, and no observable influence from harmonization to synoptic parallels. This scribal evidence agrees with other features of the text of Mark in Vaticanus, especially the 'resistance' to harmonization which marks out the Alexandrian text of Mark. In the portions of the New Testament with substantial early papyri (notably Luke, John, Paul, 1 and 2 Peter, and Jude), it can be seen that Vaticanus preserves extremely successfully a much earlier form of the text. The existence of witnesses to early forms of the text which comes to be fully embodied in Codex Vaticanus suggests a scribal community with access to excellent exemplars, and in combination with the character of Vaticanus' text of Mark and the highly controlled scribal environment in which it was created, suggests a plausibility to the view that Vaticanus also preserves an early (non-recensional) form of the text of Mark, even though we have no substantial evidence of that text before the fourth century.

Alongside Vaticanus we must also mention, although much more briefly, Codex Sinaiticus א 01 (British Library Add. Ms 43725). Among its many singular readings, Sinaiticus has far more numerous omissions: on thirty-eight occasions between one and five words are omitted (most of these, twenty-five, concern just one word), for fifty-eight words in total. There are four more substantial omissions: at 1: 32–4 (twenty words); 10: 30 (thirteen words); 10: 35–7 (twenty-two words); 15: 47–16: 1 (sixteen words). In terms of additions there are twenty-five occasions when between one and four words

[38] 1: 43: *εμβρειμησαμενος*; 3: 3: *χειραν*; 3: 11: *προσεπειπταν*; 4: 17: *θλειψεως* (also 13: 19, 24); 4: 19: *συνπνειγουσιν* (B*); 5: 4: *συντετρεισθαι*; 5: 13: *επνειγοντο*; 5: 29: *μαστειγος* (also v. 34; cf. 10: 34: *μαστειγωσουσιν*); 5: 41: *ταλειθα*; 6: 2: *γεινομεναι*; 6: 15: *ηλειας* (B*); 6: 51: *λειαν* (also 16: 2); 7: 26: *συραφοινεικισσα*; 7: 30: *κλεινην*; 12: 4: *ητειμασαν*; 13: 29: *γεινωσκετε*; 14: 60: *αποκρεινη*; 14: 64: *κατεκρειναν*; 15: 10: *εγεινωσκε*.

[39] 1: 14: *με* → *μετα*; 1: 38: *αυτοι* → *αυτοις*; 2: 10: *ιν* → *ινα*; 2: 12: *αρα* → *αρας*; 2: 26: *ος* → *ους*; 5: 13: *ακαρθατα* → *ακαθαρτα*; 5: 38: *πολλας* → *πολλα*; 6: 22: *ειελθουσης* → *εισελθουσης*; 6: 48: *περιπαντων* → *περιπατων*; 7: 5: *κοναις* → *κοιναις*; 7: 18: *ασυντοι* → *ασυνετοι*; 7: 21: *διλογισμοι* → *διαλογισμοι*; 8: 17: *συνειτε* → *συνιετε*; 8: 18: *εχοντε* → *εχοντες*; 13: 13: *στελος* → *τελος*.

[40] 1: 7: lacks *μου*²; 1: 26: lacks *το πνευμα*; 1: 36: lacks *οι* (B*); 1: 45 lacks *ην*; 2: 8 lacks *αυτοις*; 3: 4 lacks *και* (B*); 3: 34 lacks *και*; 4: 16 lacks *οι*; 5: 21 lacks *τω*; 5: 28 lacks *καν* (B*); 6: 17 lacks *την γυναικια* (B*); 6: 54 lacks *αυτων* (B*); 9: 31 lacks *αυτοις*; 10: 46 lacks *και ερχονται εις Ιερειχω* (B*); 12: 32 lacks *και*; 12: 36 lacks *εν*; 14: 32 lacks *ωδε* (B*); 15: 4 lacks *ουδεν* (B*).

[41] 1: 13: *τεσσερακοντα ημερας*; 1: 34: *τα δαιμονια λαλειν*; 11: 3: *αποστελλει παλιν αυτον*; 15: 15: *παρεδωκεν δε* . . .

[42] 6: 39: *εν* (B*) → *επι* 14: 43: *απο* 16: 5: *ελθουσαι* (cf. *εισελθουσαι*).

[43] 1: 18: *ηκολουθουν* 1: 31: *διεκονει* (B*); 1: 40: *δυνη* 4: 32: *κατασκηνοιν* 7: 9: *τηρητε* 7: 14: *λεγει* 9: 14: *ειδαν* (B*); 12: 8: *εξεβαλαν* 12: 36: *καθισον* 13: 7: *ακουητε* 14: 69: *ειπεν*.

[44] *Εαυτος* for *αυτος* (9: 8; 11: 8; 13: 34); *Καθ ιδιαν* (B*) → *κατ ιδιαν* (6: 31; 9: 28; 13: 3).

[45] 5: 36 add *τον*; 7: 37 add *ως*; 8: 37: add *ο*; 9: 25: add *εγω* (B*: *εγω εγω*).

are added (again, most of these, nineteen in all, concern just one word), for thirty-five words in total. In addition there are six clear harmonizations to the text of Matthew (at Mark 2: 12; 7: 18; 9: 45; 10: 28; 14: 64; 15: 46).[46]

Sinaiticus preserves a text of Mark akin to that of Vaticanus; agreement between the two constitutes a strong presumption in their favour in the Gospel of Mark. A good example of this is the ending of Mark where Vaticanus and Sinaiticus preserve the shorter form of the text over against the vast majority of the later Greek witnesses.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the available evidence suggests that Mark was not copied or commented upon or even alluded to as frequently as the other canonical Gospels. With one important exception we lack early papyri of Mark, although from the fourth century and later we have numerous manuscripts (all of which include Mark as one of the four canonical Gospels). A good case can be made that our fourth-century witnesses represent copies of a well preserved early text of Mark, and that the more free forms of the text, in 𝔓[45] and in Clement, could be derived from such a text. Further discoveries of papyrus manuscripts of Mark would of course be most welcome and would enable us to compare the fourth-century witnesses more extensively with earlier material (as can be done for Matthew, Luke, and John).

[46] For a fuller treatment see P. M. Head, 'The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus: Textual and Reception-Historical Considerations', *TC* 13 (2008): 1–38.

7

The Early Text of Luke

Juan Hernández, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

The early papyri of Luke are remarkable for their diversity. Six pre-fourth-century witnesses are extant. The content, date, provenance, textual relationships, and scribal habits of each vary from fragment to fragment. Their texts range from a few paltry lines to nearly an entire gospel. All were produced in the second, third, or fourth centuries. All are from Egypt—though their precise sites of discovery differ. The nature and frequency of their scribal variations also fluctuate. Nonsense readings, itacisms, and similar orthographic 'deviations' prevail in some; others exhibit little to none of these. The incidence of *nomina sacra* and numerical abbreviations varies from scribe to scribe, even line to line. Their significance is debated. The amount of surviving text is at once both an accident of history *and* a byproduct of particular scribal habits. The rates of additions, omissions, transpositions, and the like can be tracked to the individual copyist. Human hands have shaped the bequeathals of history and the absence of 'expected' readings continues to hold the imagination hostage. Questions swirl over textual alignments, while the very nomenclature of 'text types' is decried in some quarters. More than simple artifacts of early Christian piety, these papyri disclose the fault lines of Luke's textual history—well in advance of the great fourth-century codices.

EARLY FRAGMENTARY PAPYRI

$\mathfrak{P}^{7}$

$\mathfrak{P}^{4}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{7}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$ all preserve portions of Luke's Gospel. Of these, $\mathfrak{P}^{7}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$ are far too fragmentary for a comprehensive discussion of individual scribal habits, textual relationships, and transmission and social

histories. The two nonetheless exhibit features that prevail in the more extensive papyri. The short, three-verse span of $\mathfrak{P}^{7}$ possibly dates from the third or fourth century and transmits Luke 4: 1–3.[1] Three *nomina sacra* are preserved.[2] The one occurring number, however, remains unabbreviated. The tiny fragment offers no itacisms, nonsense readings, or analogous orthographic 'departures'—a byproduct, no doubt, of the small portion of surviving text, not proof of a scrupulous scribe. Singular readings also fail to materialize. But for lacunae, $\mathfrak{P}^{7}$ is identical with the texts of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ and codex Vaticanus (B).

$\mathfrak{P}^{111}$

$\mathfrak{P}^{111}$ dates to the third century and hails from Oxyrhynchus. The manuscript features a five-verse stretch of Luke 17: 11–13, 22–3. A single *nomen sacrum* appears in conflated form: *ιηυ* (cf. *ιη* in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$). Textual variation is limited. One consonant is dropped and the only consequential variant makes a syntactical rather than a semantic contribution with the support of Western witnesses.[3] Apart from this, the text of $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$ is identical with $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$. The same largely holds for $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$'s connection to B.[4] $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$ also joins both $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ and B in the omission of a single pronoun[5]—a consensus that prompted the editors of UBS^{4} to bracket the word.

$\mathfrak{P}^{69}$

The third-century $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$—also from Oxyrhynchus—offers a nine-verse sampling of Luke 22: 41, 45–8, 58–61.[6] Despite its size, $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$ has garnered an

[1] $\mathfrak{P}^{7}$ was originally dated to the 'fourth/sixth(?)' century and Kurt Aland wondered whether it might not be a patristic fragment. NA^{27}, however, currently places $\mathfrak{P}^{7}$ in the 3rd/4th(?) cent. The content of the papyrus has also been revised from 4: 1–2 to 4: 1–3. The question of its possible status as a patristic fragment has been reopened by Charles Hill, who has determined that it is indeed a patristic fragment. See C. E. Hill, 'Irenaeus, the Scribes, and the Scriptures: Papyrological and Theological Observations from P.Oxy 3.405', in S. Parvis and P. Foster, eds., *Irenaeus and his Traditions* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, forthcoming). Unfortunately, the fragment is now lost and cannot be rechecked. See K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn., tr. E. F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 96; K. Aland, 'Neue neutestamentliche Papyri', *NTS* 3 (1957): 261–5; *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967), 137–40.

[2] *ις* (4: 1); [*π*]*νς* (4: 1); *πνι* (4: 1). These belong to the class one and class two categories of *nomina sacra* as delineated by C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: OUP, 1979), 27.

[3] In 17: 22 $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$ reads *τοῦ ἐπιθυμῆσαι* with D *pc* it.

[4] With one exception: in 17: 12 $\mathfrak{P}^{111}$ reads *ἔστησαν*, whereas B reads *ἀνέστησαν*.

[5] *αὐτῷ* in 17: 12.

[6] E. Lobel *et al.*, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part XXIV* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1957), 2–3. Note the new transcription aided by the use of multi-spectral images: T. A. Wayment,

extraordinary amount of attention due in large measure to what it lacks: 22: 43–4. The omission has secured the tiny fragment a prominent spot in discussions of Luke's textual history. As with 𝔓^{7}, the text does not depart from standard orthography and nonsense readings fail to appear within its lines. Two *nomina sacra* surface; others can be reconstructed.[7] The short text also yields a number of striking singular readings, displaying considerable freedom in its scribal activity.[8] Every distinctive reading renders sensible Greek. Their quantity, however, remains an inadequate measure of scribal habits. Three characteristic D variants also surface, signaling the manuscript's tentative ties to the Western text.[9] Non-D readings, however, outnumber D readings.[10] As such, 𝔓^{69}'s text has been dubbed 'very free'; a precursor of 'the D type of text'.[11]

The omission of Luke 22: 43–4 in a number of witnesses is well-known.[12] Uncertainty attends the origin, authenticity, and function of these verses. The variation in 𝔓^{69} is unique, however. The absence of verses 43–4 in 𝔓^{69} is accompanied by the omission of v. 42, creating a three-verse gap in the manuscript. A broad canvas is therefore set up for the text-critical imagination to fill. Was the omission of vv. 42–4 accidental or deliberate? Were verses 43–4 even in the scribe's exemplar? Does the absence of the verse(s)—whether of v. 42 or vv. 42–4—obscure a more complex set of operations, culpable for their collective exclusion and resistant to a single, unifying theory? 𝔓^{69} showcases both the vicissitudes of scribal mechanics and the obscurities of transmission history.

There are insufficient data, however, for either an adequate representation of 𝔓^{69}'s textual relationships or for a reliable profile of its scribal habits. Questions over 𝔓^{69}'s exemplar and whether the omission(s) was (were)

'A New Transcription of P.Oxy. 2383 (P69)', *NovT* 50 (2008): 351–7. Wayment's transcription eliminates a singular reading created by Turner: *καθεύδοντας κοιμωμένους*, which he considered a conflation of Matt. 26: 43 and Luke 22: 45. Cf. C. Clivaz, 'Some Remarks on Thomas A. Wayment, "A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 (P^{69})"', *NovT* 52 (2010): 83–7.

[7] The *nomina sacra* belong to the first and second classes. See Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief*, 27.

[8] The singular readings include the omission of 22: 42; a grammatical and syntactical change in 22: 58 (*εἶπεν*: *ἔφη* 𝔓^{69}); a transposition in 22: 59 (*μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦν*: *ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ* 𝔓^{69}), and a number of substituted terms in 22: 61 (*κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ*: *Πέτρο[ς ἐνέβλεψεν αὐ]τῷ* 𝔓^{69} and *καί*^{2}: *τότε* 𝔓^{69} Am st).

[9] Turner, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXIV*, 2.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Aland and Aland, *Text of the New Testament*, 100.

[12] 𝔓^{75} א^{1} A B N T W 579.1071*. *l* 844 *pc* f sy^{s} sa bo^{pt}; Hier^{mss}. For a comprehensive discussion of the tradition, see C. Clivaz, 'The Angel and the Sweat like "Drops of Blood" Luke 22: 43–44: 𝔓^{69} and f^{13}', *HTR* 98/4 (2005): 419–40; *L'Ange et la sueur de sange (Lc 22, 43–44) ou comment on pourrait bien encore écrire l'histoire* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).

deliberate are deprived of a definitive answer.[13] Nonetheless, $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$ clearly joins the textual stream that lacks 22: 43–4. The significance of the omission of v. 42—and whether it can be linked to the absence of vv. 43–4—is less certain.[14]

MORE EXTENSIVE PAPYRI

$\mathfrak{P}^{4}$

The greater amount of text available for $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ showcases scribal practices unattested—or attested only partially—in the aforementioned papyri. Its orthographic patterns, number, and distribution of *nomina sacra*, use of lectional aids, and the presence of singular readings of apparent theological import are among the manuscript's distinctive features. The traces of early Christian piety emerge prominently in $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$. Questions over its putative connection to $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$–$\mathfrak{P}^{67}$ persist.[15]

[13] Turner cited homoeoteleuton for the omission of 42, 45a, arguing that the scribe's eye travelled from *προσηύχετο* in v. 41 to *προσευχῆς* in v. 45b. For that theory to hold, the number of lines jumped could not be too great; Turner thus argued for the absence of vv. 43–4 from the exemplar. Wayment's recent transcription, however, restores 45a, thereby removing the premise for homoeoteleuton. This does not mean that the omission is deliberate; it simply means that the omission cannot be explained as a careless leap *due to homoeoteleuton*. Aland, noting $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$'s paraphrastic tendencies, argued for a deliberate omission of 42–5a, but refused to speculate as to whether 43–4 were in the scribe's exemplar. With so little of the MS extant it is difficult to determine the degree to which paraphrastic tendencies can be cited as a factor in the omission. Ascertaining the verses' presence in the exemplar or claiming a deliberate excision is beyond our capacities at this point. See Turner, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXIV*, 3 n. 4; K. Aland, 'Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im Neuen Testament: Betrachtungen zu P69 und 0171', in S. Janeras, ed., *Miscellània papirològica Ramón Roca-Puig* (Barcelona: Fundacio Salvador Vives Casajuana, 1987), 37–61.

[14] Connecting the omission of v. 42 to the omission of vv. 43–4 is problematic. The omission of v. 42 is a singular reading; the omission of vv. 43–4 appears to follow part of the textual tradition. Without knowing whether or not vv. 43–4 were in the exemplar, we cannot say whether the omission was of v. 42 or of vv. 42–4. Speculation about motives for the omission (s)—such as the proposal that $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$ might be a Marcionite version of Luke—is even more tenuous, *contra* Clivaz, 'Angel and the Sweat', 419–40.

[15] If $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$'s connection to $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$–$\mathfrak{P}^{67}$ can be demonstrated conclusively, it would deliver the earliest four-gospel codex. See Roberts, *Manuscript, Society, and Belief*, 12–13; T. C. Skeat, 'The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?', *NTS* 43 (1997): 1–34; G. N. Stanton, 'The Fourfold Gospel', *NTS* 43 (1997): 317–46. Head and Charlesworth accept the paleographic data—that the three papyri were copied by the same scribe—but reject the codicological data—that they pertain to the same codex. See Peter M. Head, 'Is P^4, P^{64}, and P^{67} the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T. C. Skeat', *NTS* 51 (2005): 450–7. S. D. Charlesworth, 'T. C. Skeat, P64 + 67 and P4, and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction', *NTS* 53 (2007): 582–604.

Discovered in Coptos and dating to the early third/perhaps late second century,[16] $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ preserves about ninety-six verses of Luke's Gospel. The unmistakable marks of its early Christian readership appear on its leaves. Section divisions,[17] punctuation marks, and omission signs permeate its text.[18] Editorial features fall within the purview of the copyist; the manuscript's usage appears to be public rather than private, produced in a controlled setting.

As with the great majority of manuscripts, the most common orthographic variation remains the *ι* > *ει* itacism. Every other vocalic variation occurs only once in this manuscript. One consonantal variation, however, exhibits an interesting—if not indicative—pattern. In $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$, the combination -*νν*- is consistently reduced to -*ν*- in the proper noun *Ἰωάννης*. These variants are not singular; no claims can be made about scribal proclivities. The variation, however, is supported in every instance by $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ B D, suggesting that the pattern first surfaced in the scribe's exemplar.

The small number of *nomina sacra* is consonant with $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$'s status as an early witness. Consistent *nomina sacra* that surface include those of the first and second order. *Ἰησοῦς* is the one exception, rendered as a *nomen sacrum* everywhere except 3: 29. The exception, however, appears to prove the rule in this case. *Ἰησοῦς* refers to Joshua—not Jesus—in 3: 29.[19] The scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ appears to exercise a discretion uncharacteristic of other scribes in that verse. The absence of third-category *nomina sacra* may be due to the fact that so few of the relevant terms surface in the extant portions of $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$.[20]

$\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ contains nine singular readings. The inclusion of coincidental agreements raises the number to fourteen.[21] The ratio of additions to omissions—though from limited data—reveals a scribe who adds more than he omits.[22] The scribe also reproduces a nonsense reading,[23] renders an infelicitous phrase,[24] offers a variant spelling for a word,[25] and drops four words—two

[16] K. Aland *et al.*, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd edn. (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1994), 29.

[17] Dashes over words indicate new paragraphs in 1: 76, 80; 2: 1; 3: 19, 21, 23, 5: 36; 6: 1, 6, 12.

[18] Roberts, *Manuscript, Society, and Belief*, 23.

[19] The scribe had originally written the *nomen sacrum* in 3: 29 but then corrected it to the long form once he realized it referred to Joshua. See T. Wasserman, 'A Textual Analysis of $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$', SBL Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Ga., 22 Nov. 2010.

[20] The paucity of *nomina sacra* cannot be used to claim an 'early phase of evolutionary development' in the abbreviations. The *nomina sacra* for 'cross' and 'crucify' e.g. do not occur in $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ because that portion of Luke is not extant, *contra* Comfort and Barrett, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, corr. and enl. (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale, 2001), 53.

[21] Five additions are found in 1: 65*; 1: 76; 3: 27; 6: 6a; 6: 6b; four omissions in 1: 64; 1: 64b*; 1: 68*; 3: 9*; five substitutions in 1: 65*; 3: 22; 5: 4; 5: 31; 5: 37 (1: 65* is also counted with the additions); and two transpositions in 1: 64b*; 5: 3 (1: 64b* is also counted with the omissions).

[22] Every addition (5) and omission (4) consists of a single word each, resulting in a net gain of only one word to the text.

[23] 3: 27 *τοῦ*: *τοῦ οὐ* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$.

[24] 5: 3 *καθίσας δὲ*: *δὲ. καθίσας* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$.

[25] 1: 64a* *ἀνεῴθχη*: *ἠ[νεῴθχη]* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ 205 983.

carelessly.[26] The scribe appears to harmonize as well.[27] Other variations generate a shift in emphasis[28] or reflect contextual considerations.[29] Two singular readings may reflect theological concerns.[30]

The text of $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ exhibits over 90 percent agreement with both $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ and B.[31] The agreements are not for all the same variants, however. The singular readings of $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ account for almost all of its deviations from both witnesses. The readings that remain consist of minor variations. $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ are identical in forty complete verses with only five significant variants lying between them.[32]

$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$

$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$—both generally and in its particulars—resists easy classification. The manuscript stands apart from others not only in its content but also in the arrangements of its Gospels, the paucity of its editorial features,[33] overall scribal habits and practices, and textual alignments. Dating from the first half of the third century and preserving about five chapters of Luke, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$'s Gospels appear to have been arranged in the Western order (Matthew, John, Luke, Mark).[34] Its scribal habits rank among the best of the early Greek NT

[26] The omissions in 1: 68 (*κύριος*: om $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ W it vg) and 3: 9 (*καλόν*: om $\mathfrak{P}^{4vid}$ lat; Or) can be explained as products of homoeoteleuton, *contra* Philip W. Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2008), 169.

[27] Four singulars may be explained as harmonizing: 1: 65* *διελαλεῖτο*: *καί*. (W it) *ἐλάλεῖτό* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ 1675 (appears to harmonize to *καὶ ἐλάλει* in 1: 64); 6: 6a *ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ*: *ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ*: $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ (appears to harmonize to 6: 7, 9 *ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ*); 6: 6b *ἡ δεξιά*: *ἡ δεξιὰ αὐτοῦ*: $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ (appears to harmonize to *ἡ χείρ αὐτοῦ* in the same verse); and 5: 37 *ῥήξει*: *ῥήγνυσι* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ (may have been changed from the future to the present tense under the influence of the prior: *βάλλει*; the influence of the present passive *ῥήγνυνται* in the Matt. 9: 17 parallel cannot be ruled out).

[28] 1: 64b* *τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα*: *παραχρῆμα τὸ στόμα* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ 213 472 vg Chrys nat Jo Bapt.

[29] The switch in 5: 31 from the plural to the singular (*αὐτούς*: *αὐτόν* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$), may reflect the understanding that Jesus' primary audience is Levi rather than the crowds (cf. 5: 27). One wonders whether similar contextual considerations lie behind the switch in 5: 4 (*χαλάσατε*: *χαλασαι* $\mathfrak{P}^{4vid}$). The variant *χαλασαι* may be an itacistic attempt at writing the imperative singular of *χαλασάω*, perhaps under the influence of the preceding singular imperative: *ἐπανάγαγε*.

[30] The addition of the article in 1: 76 is noteworthy (*κυρίου*: *τοῦ κυ* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$), as is the change from the accusative to the dative in 3: 22 (*πνεῦμα*: *πνι* $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$). The variant in 3: 22 may indicate that the Holy Spirit descended in 'a spiritual form' or 'as spirit'. Either option appears to sidestep the specter of the Holy Spirit descending in 'bodily' form.

[31] Comfort and Barrett, *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 43.

[32] 3: 22, 36; 5: 39; 6: 11, 14.

[33] Ekthesis, vacant line ends, spaces, and the *paragraphos* were not used; medial points for text divisions were employed inconsistently. See Charlesworth, 'Public and Private: Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts', in C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias, eds., *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 165–7.

[34] F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus in the Greek Bible*, fasc. 2. *The Gospels and Acts*, *Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1933), p. viii; T. C. Skeat, 'A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P45)', *Herm* 155 (1993): 27–43.

papyri;[35] its textual history, the most idiosyncratic. The manuscript itself appears to have been produced in an uncontrolled setting, perhaps for private use.[36] Its provenance is the Fayyum.[37]

Scribal Habits in 𝔓[45]

The number of orthographic variations traceable to the scribe is small. Only two orthographic singulars surface. Non-singular readings, on the other hand, feature a broad array of vocalic variations—though never more than one or two examples apiece. As with almost every other extant manuscript, the $\iota<\epsilon\iota$ itacism remains the most common. Only one orthographic variation is consonantal. Three nonsense readings surface, confirming—along with the small number of orthographic singulars—the scribe's penchant for careful copying. Corrections are also few: two emerge. 𝔓[45]'s scribal activity results in the production of sensible readings in almost every instance.[38]

Most of the numbers in 𝔓[45]'s text of Luke remain unabbreviated; only four are shortened. *Nomina sacra* on the other hand, occur with great regularity. As with most scribes the practice is not thoroughgoing. *Nomina sacra* of the first, second, and third orders occur throughout. A few are abbreviated without exception. The codex also provides early examples of the staurogram in two locations, furnishing—along with 𝔓[75]—our earliest iconographic depictions of Christ's crucifixion.[39]

The text of Luke in 𝔓[45] features a greater number of omissions than additions—a ratio of 9:23. All but one of the additions are of one word; the remaining one, a five-word addition. Thirteen words are thus added to Luke. Of the nine singular readings classified as additions, five are the product of harmonizing.[40] Unlike the additions, scribal omissions show greater variations in length. While most (thirteen) of these consist of one word, six are of two words, three of three words, and one is a seventeen-word omission. Fifty-one words are omitted in all. The text of Luke thus suffers a thirty-eight-word loss

[35] Here I refer primarily to the scribe's production of sensible readings. In 'absolute ranking', 𝔓[45] ranks highest in orthography and second highest in the avoidance of nonsense readings. See James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 905.

[36] Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 165–6.

[37] E. J. Epp, 'The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: "Not without Honor Except in their Hometown"', *JBL* 123/1 (2003): 13 n. 27.

[38] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 118–25.

[39] L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006), 153. See also Ch. 3 above.

[40] Four are to the immediate context (12: 55; 12: 58a; 13: 32b; 14: 5a); 1 is to a parallel (12: 24a to Matt. 6: 26). Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 189–94.

at the hands of our scribe. Careless leaps and a tendency to shorten the text account for most of the omissions.[41] Textual clarity is not sacrificed in the process.[42]

The scribe's tendency to make careless leaps is manifest in the manuscript's transpositions. 𝔓45 features fifteen transpositions, six of which are forward leaps. Only one of the transpositions stems from harmonizing. Most of the transpositions qualify as corrections of careless omissions. The scribe inserted the words where he could rather than make corrections by erasures, dots, or other marks. The preservation of ideas—rather than word order—appears to have been the scribe's primary concern.[43] Transpositions range from two to seven words in length.[44] Twenty-five substitutions surface among Luke's singular readings. Nine of these are due to harmonizing.[45] A handful of the substitutions provoke intrigue.[46] Those that remain are grammatical.

Harmonization to the immediate context—whether in the form of additions, substitutions, or transpositions—accounts for the majority of the scribe's textual corruptions. Harmonization to gospel parallels ranks second, almost every example of which gravitates toward Matthew.[47]

Textual Relationships in 𝔓45

𝔓45's textual history is idiosyncratic at points, siding neither with Alexandrian nor Western (or Byzantine) witnesses. Textual alignments appear ambivalent, even enigmatic compared with other manuscripts. Most of the scholarship pertaining to 𝔓45's textual relationships has focused almost exclusively on the manuscript's connection to the so-called Caesarean text type in Mark's gospel. 𝔓45 was once considered (along with W, f^1, and f^{13}) to be a pre-Caesarean witness in Mark 5–16. Quantitative analyses have shown, however, that while

41 Harmonization to a gospel parallel appears to account for only one omission: 10: 11a. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 187.

42 Ibid. 125–41.

43 Ibid. 160.

44 Ibid. 142–61.

45 Six substitutions harmonize to the immediate context; one to general usage; and two to synoptic parallels (9: 30 [to Matt. 17: 13 and Mark 9: 4] 11: 12 [to Mark 7: 9]). Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 161–73, 186–97.

46 Two are intriguing (9: 50; 10: 42); and two are unusual in their complexity (11: 15; 11: 36). See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 170, 173, 176, 178, 178 n. 374.

47 There are four: 9: 30 (Matt. 17: 3; Mark 9: 4); 10: 11a (Matt. 10: 14; Luke 9: 5); 11: 12 (Matt. 7: 9); 12: 24a (Matt. 6: 26). If we include sub-singular readings, there are seven: 11: 31* (Matt. 12: 42); 11: 42c* (Matt. 23: 23); 12: 4* (Luke 21: 9); 12: 7b* (Matt. 10: 30); 12: 24b* (Matt. 6: 26); 12: 51* (Matt. 10: 34); and 13: 30* (Matt. 19: 30 and Mark 10: 31). See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 188–9.

𝔓⁴⁵ and W are members of a group, they share no significant textual alignments with Codex Koridethi (the Caesarean text's chief representative). 𝔓⁴⁵ and W were thus found to be neither pre-Caesarean nor Caesarean at all in Mark.[48]

The remaining gospels in 𝔓⁴⁵ have not received the same scrutiny. Elsewhere 𝔓⁴⁵ is generally believed to stand somewhere between Alexandrian and so-called Western manuscripts. The impression often given is of a mixture of 'neutral' and Western readings throughout the manuscript.[49] This characterization fails to represent Luke's textual alignments adequately, however. Only about 10 percent of Luke's non-singular readings are supported primarily by D.[50] Out of 223 readings in 𝔓⁴⁵, only twenty-two are connected to D and/or the Old Latin:

3 are supported by D alone.
5 are supported by D + Old Latin.
2 are supported by Old Latin alone.
13 are supported by D + Old Latin + a few minuscules.
4 are supported by D + a few minuscules.

On the other hand, 𝔓⁴⁵'s close ties to primary Alexandrian witnesses prevail throughout the text of Luke. Of 223 non-singular readings, 165 fall within this category:

94 are supported by 𝔓⁴⁵ + 𝔓⁷⁵ + א + B.
21 are supported by 𝔓⁴⁵ + 𝔓⁷⁵ + B.
13 are supported by 𝔓⁴⁵ + B.
16 are supported by 𝔓⁴⁵ + א.
12 are supported by 𝔓⁴⁵ + 𝔓⁷⁵.
7 are supported by 𝔓⁴⁵ + א + B.
2 are supported by 𝔓⁴⁵ + 𝔓⁷⁵ + א.

The importance of 𝔓⁴⁵ for modern critical editions is evident in NA²⁷'s text of Luke. Of the 165 readings supported by primary Alexandrian witnesses in 𝔓⁴⁵, 136 are adopted by the critical edition and another ten are bracketed.

48 L. W. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981).

49 So Comfort and Barrett, *Text of the Earliest Greek New Testament Manuscripts*, 162.

50 Of 225/223 non-singular readings in 𝔓⁴⁵, only three are supported by D (9: 31*; 11: 34c; 11: 52b); only five are supported by D and Old Latin (9: 27; 9: 36b; 9: 62; 11: 21; 14: 10b); thirteen are supported by D, Old Latin, and a few minuscules (9: 40; 9: 48; 10: 14b; 10: 31*; 11: 31*; 11: 33; 11: 44; 11: 52 (f^{13} support); 12: 24 (f^{13} support); 12: 56b; 12: 58; 13: 13; 13: 17a); only four are supported by D and a few minuscules (10: 19*; 12: 51; 13: 9; 13: 17b); only two are supported by *Old Latin* (10: 16*; 10: 20). Thus—in total of 225—only twenty-seven can be characterized as Western. If we remove those Western readings considered coincidental agreements by Royse (five asterisked above), the number is down to twenty-two. It would be inaccurate to say that 𝔓⁴⁵—at least in Luke—falls midway between B and D texts.

The remaining thirty-six readings appear to have no primary Alexandrian or Western alliances, supported only by a few mixed witnesses. The breakdown of non-singular readings in $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ appears to be 'Alexandrian'[51] (74%), other (16%), and Western (10%). These suggestive data are preliminary and exploratory, however. A full quantitative and comprehensive profile analysis remains to be conducted.[52]

$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$

The importance of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ as a witness to the early text of Luke is without question. Its discovery clarified—if not resolved—a number of key issues related to Luke's textual history. Other questions remain without a definitive answer. $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$'s textual alliances have been examined extensively; its scribal habits tracked to the individual syllable. Queries over the existence of an Alexandrian text type are now pushed back into the second century; the hopes of salvaging any notion of an early Alexandrian recension all but gone. The authenticity of the Western non-interpolations, however, remains in dispute. The manuscript's early third-century support for the longer readings has not settled the issue.

$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ dates to the third century (*c.*200) and is the earliest and most extensive papyrus containing Luke's Gospel. Its ultimate origin, however, remains unknown. The manuscript—with its text divisions, punctuation marks, rough breathings, and large script—may indicate that it was read publicly, perhaps in worship settings.[53]

Scribal Habits in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$

$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$'s lengthy text offers an opportunity to explore the interplay of its scribal habits and textual alliances. Knowledge of a manuscript's singular readings is generally considered useful for tracking scribal habits and facilitating textual decisions. By offering specific data on particular manuscripts, singular

[51] 'Alexandrian' is used advisedly until a full quantitative analysis is conducted. The term here simply signals that these readings find support among one or more witnesses usually identified as Alexandrian. It is of course possible for an Alexandrian witness to support a non-Alexandrian reading.

[52] The data from the IGNTP also needs to be rechecked against the individual extant MSS. Further, it must be recalled that $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ lacks about nineteen chapters of Luke's Gospel. Block mixture is a possibility. Interestingly, the Teststellen method of *Text und Textwert* does not contradict the findings above: D (05) does not appear among the witnesses with affinities to $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$. See K. Aland *et al.*, *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, iv/3 (2) (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 138.

[53] Charlesworth, 'Public and Private', 158–61.

readings provide an alternative to generalizations about scribal activity. A better informed textual decision is therefore possible.[54] More often than not, however, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$'s scribal habits disclose the fault lines between the copyist's idiosyncrasies and the manuscript's textual relationships. Scribal activity may offer an analogue for how certain variations occur. It cannot decide the issue.

$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ showcases a far greater number of orthographic singulars than $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$. Twenty surface. Vowel confusions, elisions, the simplification and gemination of consonants count among these.[55] Nonsense readings abound[56] and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$'s corrections outpace $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$'s. Sixty-one improvements surface, almost all of which are undertaken by the scribe himself.[57] And yet, the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ produces a more accurate copy of Luke than $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$.[58] *Nomina sacra* occur liberally and with varying degrees of consistency; the cross is rendered as a staurogram in every instance. Numerical abbreviations abound for lower numbers. Larger numbers are written fully.

Omissions outpace additions in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$. Four words are added; twenty-eight are dropped. Luke-$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ hemorrhages a total of twenty-four words at the hands of our scribe.[59] Two, perhaps three, of the omissions are due to harmonizing.[60] Two, possibly four, are forward leaps.[61] An adequate explanation for most omissions proves elusive. Carelessness appears a factor in most. The tendency to omit also appears to lie behind two out of four transpositions in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$.[62]

Substitutions constitute the highest number of singular readings in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$-Luke. Twenty-three materialize. Four are the product of harmonizing; one is a forward leap; another appears to be a dittography. The remaining substitutions emerge in a variety of forms, bereft of a clear pattern or editorial strategy. Conjunctions, verb tenses, and cases are exchanged; augments added and omitted; prefixes dropped and aggregated.[63] Apart from the substitutions, one conflation surfaces and a proper name is added.[64]

The scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ thus omits more than he adds, harmonizes with some regularity, and makes sporadic—if not haphazard—grammatical and stylistic changes. The generation of a high number of orthographic and nonsense singulars—against the backdrop of his subsequent corrections—indicates

[54] E. C. Colwell, 'Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$', *Studies and Methodology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969): 106–24.

[55] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 647–51.

[56] Ibid. 651–6.

[57] On the various types of corrections and correctors ibid. 625–47.

[58] The error rate of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$'s scribe is the lowest of the six papyri surveyed by Royse. See *Scribal Habits*, 656–9, 905.

[59] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 660–6.

[60] Ibid. 690–8.

[61] Ibid. 670–2.

[62] Ibid. 672.

[63] Ibid. 673–87.

[64] Ibid. 687–90.

that the scribe copied with care, but not with unusual care. The scribal profile also serves to temper speculation over the origin of some readings.[65] Variants initially considered extraordinary or even 'theological' are more easily explained as random stylistic improvements, the product of carelessness, harmonization to a variety of parallels, or even the faithful reproduction of the scribe's *Vorlage*.[66]

Textual Relationships in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$

The text of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ is remarkably close to that of B. The two manuscripts agree over 90 percent of the time. $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ and B are also the sole witnesses for a large number of readings—readings once considered singular prior to $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$'s discovery. B is not a direct descendant of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, however. Differing line lengths and significant textual variations rule this out. The text of Luke in each manuscript appears to derive from a common ancestor reaching back to the second century. Both witnesses are firmly grounded in the Alexandrian tradition, evident even by their disagreements. Wherever the readings of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ and B diverge, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ finds support from other Alexandrian witnesses, including the Coptic.[67]

The discovery of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ served to debunk the idea that codex B was the product of a fourth-century recension. Recensional activity explained the emergence of the nearly pristine fourth-century codex against the backdrop of the earlier, chaotic papyri. The appearance of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ falsified that theory; an early third-century manuscript that is nearly identical to the mid-fourth-century B had now surfaced. Any notion of recensional activity would have to be pushed back into the second century. The burden of proof now lay with advocates of the theory. A comparison of the textual character of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$-B with other manuscript traditions, however, offers little evidence of any kind of

[65] $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$'s peculiar readings in 9: 34; 10: 31; 11: 31; 14: 8; and 16: 30 have often been singled out for special comment. In every case, however, a simpler, less spectacular—or speculative—explanation for the readings is available. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 645, 645 n. 152, 665, 665 n. 272, 666–7, 690, 701, and 701 n. 441.

[66] This appears to be the case with every example cited by Parsons to establish a theological tendency on the part of the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 698–703; cf. M. C. Parsons, 'A Christological Tendency in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$', *JBL* 105 (1986): 463–79; *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987).

[67] E. C. Colwell and E. W. Tune, 'Method in Establishing Textual Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts', *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 45–55; C. M. Martini, *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966); G. D. Fee, '$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria', in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 247–73.

recensional activity within the Alexandrian 'text type'. 𝔓75 and B appear to represent a relatively pure form of preservation of a relatively pure line of descent from the earliest attainable text.[68]

Western Non-Interpolations in 𝔓75

𝔓75's relative purity and antiquity only increase the mystery surrounding its disputed readings. The Western non-interpolations are chief among these. Nine Western non-interpolations were identified by Westcott and Hort. Eight are at issue in 𝔓75. These are readings, which—surprisingly and atypical of them—are shorter than their Alexandrian counterparts and are purported to preserve the 'original text'. The text of 𝔓75, however, bears witness to the longer, non-Western readings. The fact that 𝔓75 goes back to a very pure line of text—as far back as the second century—means that the corruption, whichever way it went, entered Luke's textual stream very early.

𝔓75 sides with nearly the entire textual tradition in its support for the longer readings in Luke 22: 19b–20; 24: 3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, and 52. The position taken here, however, is that their omission—attested by D and a variety of its allies—requires a simpler collection of arguments than their inclusion. The longer readings are conspicuous in their form and function. Each appears to fill particular lacunae by supplement or free harmonization. The shorter readings, on the other hand, are supported by intrinsic probabilities—the only criteria to clear the second-century threshold.

Luke 22: 19b–20

Two versions of the Lord's Supper surface in Luke's textual history. The shorter text, supported by D and the oldest Latin manuscripts, omits the atonement language of vv. 19b–20.[69] 𝔓75 joins the rest of the textual tradition in supporting the longer text. External evidence settles the question in favor of 22: 19b–20. The shorter text—with its omission of any reference to the death of Jesus—is the more difficult reading, however. No other account of the institution fails to associate the meal with Jesus' death.[70] The shorter text appears deficient in this respect.

68 Fee, '𝔓75, 𝔓66, and Origen', 247–73.

69 D e a b ff2 i l.

70 But for the Western non-interpolation, every other account of the Institution underscores the atoning nature of Jesus' death: Matt. 26: 26–9; Mark 14: 22–5; Luke 22: 19–20 (𝔓75 *rell*); 1 Cor. 11: 23–5.

The deficiency is remedied by Luke 22: 19b–20. The passage's affinities to 1 Corinthians 11: 23–25 raise the specter of a harmonization. Stylistic features and wording atypical of Luke further suspicions of a corruption.[71] Most uncharacteristic is the passage's depiction of Jesus' death as an atonement—a move that appears to run counter to Luke's presentation of the death as a miscarriage of justice.[72] An accidental omission lacks orthographic plausibility and a deliberate excision—due to the irregular cup sequence—raises more questions than it answers.[73] An assimilation of the Pauline institution appears likely.

Luke 24: 3

The second Western-non interpolation consists of the omission of *τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* in 24: 3. The omission is preserved by D and the Old Latin.[74] 𝔓[75] includes the phrase with the majority of the textual tradition.[75] The words are *prima facie* suspect however. The phrase is nearly unique in the canonical Gospels; its sole occurrence is restricted to the longer ending of Mark—a corruption *par excellence*. The phrase is attested in Acts. Its usage there, however, appears to be at odds with its sense in Luke 24: 3.[76] An accidental omission is implausible and a deliberate excision unimaginable. Its insertion appears to have been deliberate, perhaps on pious or even theological grounds.[77]

[71] These include: *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, *ἀνάμνησιν*, and *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου.*

[72] Luke's redaction of Mark appears to suppress the atoning features of Jesus' death and the speeches in Acts consistently portray Jesus' death as a miscarriage of justice, reversed by God at the resurrection. See B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York and Oxford: OUP, 1993), 199–204.

[73] Only the longer reading of Luke offers a cup before (v. 17) and after the supper (v. 20). Hort considered a deliberate excision of vv. 19b–20—due to the double cup reference—implausible. It is improbable that the most familiar form, which happens to line up with Paul, was selected for omission, while the less familiar wording and sequence (e.g. the cup before the bread) was kept. A handful of witnesses in the Western tradition also appear to reflect the difficulty presented by the shorter text; a few of the versions correct the irregular sequence with a number of transpositions and omissions. See B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek: Notes on Selected Readings* (Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 63–4. See also D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 151–7. On the role of 22: 19b–20 in 2nd-cent. theological polemics, see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 197–204.

[74] D e a b ff^{2} l r^{1}.

[75] A third textual tradition attests: *τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* 579. 1241 *pc* sy$^{s.c.p.}$ bo^{ms}.

[76] Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 219; see also Parker, *Living Text*, 165–6.

[77] Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 219.

Luke 24: 6

The omission of *οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη*—supported by D and the Old Latin—constitutes the third Western non-interpolation.[78] $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ supports the coordinating clauses with the rest of the tradition. The words bear a clear resemblance to parallels in Matthew and Mark. The reading is not disqualified *tout court* as a consequence; the Synoptic Gospels ought to resemble one other. The reading does prove redundant in Luke however. It supplies what the context already implies. A harmonization in the direction of Matthew 28: 6/Mark 16: 6 appears likely.[79] Incidentally, the longer reading of 24: 6 (as that of 24: 52) mirrors the kind of harmonizing practiced by the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ toward Matthew.[80]

Luke 24: 12

Nearly the entire textual tradition supports the longer reading of 24: 12. D and the Old Latin are the exceptions.[81] The passage, however, is suspect for its non-Lukan features. The use of the historic present and the appearance of non-Lukan terms count among these.[82] The fact that the disputed terms and tense also surface in the Johannine parallel heightens suspicions of a textual corruption.[83] An accidental omission is ruled out on orthographic grounds and a deliberate excision appears unlikely.

The longer reading is not a simple harmonization, however. Most of the harmonizing available for inspection is less complex. The harmonization in 24: 12 borders on a reconstruction.[84] Moreover, none of the harmonizing in $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$-Luke moves in the direction of John's Gospel. The manuscript's scribal habits do not offer an analogue for the direction of the putative harmonizing suspected here. The move is not without its parallel, however. The longer

[78] D e a b ff^2 l r^1.

[79] Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 71; Parker, *Living Text*, 166–7.

[80] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 690–2.

[81] D a b e l r^1.

[82] Luke redacts ninety-two of the ninety-three occurrences of the historic present in Mark; thus, the presence of *βλέπει* in 24: 12 is conspicuous. The non-Lukan terms include: *παρακύψας*, *ὀθόνια*, *ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτόν*, all of which appear in the parallel in John 20: 3–10. See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 214.

[83] So Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 70; Parker, *Living Text*, 167–8. To claim that the similarity with John is due to 'the likelihood that both evangelists have drawn from a common tradition' (*TCGNT*^{2}, 158), blurs the distinction between text-critical and source-critical claims. To answer a text-critical question with a source-critical argument—without first establishing ground rules for assessing the validity of each—obscures the issues. The same problem surfaces in Metzger's discussion of the longer reading in 24: 36. See *TCGNT*^{2}, 160.

[84] Parker calls it a 'summary.' See *Living Text*, 167.

ending of Mark 16 offers comparable data—albeit on a grander scale—for the kind of reconstructive harmonizing operative here.[85]

Luke 24: 36

The longer reading of Luke 24: 36 is identical to the parallel in John 20: 19.[86] D and the Old Latin omit the sentence against the rest of the textual tradition.[87] The use of the historic present is once again suspect.[88] The passage also appears to make better contextual sense without the words in question.[89] An accidental omission cannot be ruled out; several examples of this kind of omission surface within the manuscript tradition.[90] An accidental omission, however, is unlikely to have occurred in the Western tradition alone. A harmonization in the direction of John's Gospel is likely.

Luke 24: 40

D, the Old Latin, and the Syriac support the sixth Western non-interpolation.[91] 𝔓^{75} aligns itself once again with the rest of the textual tradition in its support for the longer reading. A repeated pattern emerges—with the exception of a single word, the longer reading is identical to the parallel in John.[92] The reading also appears redundant within the immediate context of Luke 24. The scribal tendency to prune the text of superfluous features could have been a sufficient cause for a deliberate excision.[93] Without corroborative data of such a tendency in D or its allies, however, the suggestion sheds its persuasive force. A harmonization toward John is more plausible.[94]

85 Ibid. 167–8. The case for an anti-docetic, orthodox corruption is made by Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 212–17.

86 Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 72; Parker, *Living Text*, 168–9.

87 D a b e ff^{2} l r^{1}.

88 Here *λέγει*, which, while not uncommon in Luke, is rare. The historic present occurs about 150 times in Mark and John respectively. See Parker, *Living Gospels*, 169.

89 The fear of the disciples is more understandable without Jesus' injunction to 'peace'. See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 220.

90 Parker may be too quick to dismiss the possibility of an accidental omission here. A leap can easily be imagined: *αὐτῶν̲ καὶ λέγει εἰρήνη ὑμῖν̲*. Royse offers precisely this kind of evidence among the singular readings of the papyri. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 667; cf. Parker, *Living Text*, 169.

91 D a b e ff^{2} l r^{1} sy$^{s.c}$.

92 Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 72; Parker, *Living Gospels*, 169.

93 So K. Aland, 'Die Bedeutung des P^{75} für den Text des Neuen Testaments: Ein Beitrag zur Frage des "Western Non-Interpolations"', in K. Aland, ed., *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967), 169.

94 For the argument that the scribe took over a tradition known from the Fourth Gospel to strengthen an orthodox interpretation of the text, namely the physicality of Jesus' body after the resurrection, see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 218.

Luke 24: 51

The longer reading of Luke 24: 51 presents a different set of challenges. Codex Sinaiticus and the Georgian join D and the Old Latin in support of the Western non-interpolation.[95] An accidental omission is possible—if not probable—in the case of Codex Sinaiticus.[96] A similar explanation for the Western text is doubtful; its omission appears to be connected to other changes within the tradition. The corruption—whether an addition or omission—appears to have been deliberate.

The motive for a deliberate excision is disputed. An attempt to remove a double-ascension in Luke's two-volume work is often posited.[97] The assertion that Acts refers to a previously narrated ascension in Luke, however, is itself in question.[98] The longer reading once again gives reason for pause. The passage features a word that appears nowhere else in Luke's two-volume work; nor is the term deployed to refer to the ascension. The chronological discrepancy also vanishes without the longer reading. The reading may have been introduced at a time when Luke-Acts were separated by one or more gospels in the canon.[99] Corroborative patristic data indicate that the bodily ascension of Jesus was in dispute by the second century—a factor to be considered in weighing the textual evidence.[100]

Luke 24: 52

The final reading at issue surfaces in 24: 52. Once again D and its allies stand against the entire textual tradition.[101] The argument for an omission—either deliberately or accidentally—fails on a number of counts. An accidental omission lacks orthographic plausibility and a deliberate excision is once

95 א* D a b e ff^2 l (sy^s) geo^1.

96 Careless scribal omissions due to homoeoteleuton abound in Sinaiticus. See Juan Hernández Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 70–5; Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, ed. D. C. Parker and D. G. K. Taylor (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2007), 246.

97 One occurring shortly after the resurrection (Luke 24: 51; recapitulated in Acts 1: 2) and the second in Acts 1: 9, forty days later.

98 Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 229.

99 Parker, *Living Text*, 171 n. 27.

100 The case for an insertion to emphasize the bodily ascension of Jesus is made by Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 231–2. The argument for a deletion in order to eradicate the bodily ascension is made by A. W. Zwiep 'The Text of the Ascension Narratives (Luke 24: 50–53; Acts 1: 1–2, 9–11)'. *NTS* 42 (1996): 219–44; cf. Epp, 'The Ascension in the Textual Tradition of Luke-Acts', in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism* (Oxford: OUP, 1981), 131–45.

101 D a b ff^2 l sy^s.

again unimaginable. The reading reads like another harmonization—as with the longer reading of 24: 6—in the direction of Matthew.[102]

CONCLUSION

The extant, early papyri of Luke reflect a good, even excellent transmission. 𝔓[75] delivers a text of Luke that existed in the second century, faithfully preserved along two separate textual streams (𝔓[75]-B). The extant portions of 𝔓[7], 𝔓[111], and 𝔓[4] essentially reproduce the Alexandrian text of 𝔓[75]. Even 𝔓[45], routinely characterized as a 'mixed' text, aligns itself primarily with Alexandrian witnesses in Luke's Gospel. Only 𝔓[69] appears to go its own way with a mixture of D and non-D readings. Even here—with only nine verses extant—the possibility of block mixture cannot be ruled out.

Significant textual variation is an integral part of the early text of Luke—not an indication of textual chaos. Apart from individual scribal proclivities, copyists are responsible for the reproduction of readings whose origins are otherwise unknown. The variation in Luke 22: 43–4, transmitted along two or more streams of textual evidence, is one such example. The Western non-interpolations constitute another set. Others may be added. Each is a by-product of scrupulous copying practices.

Studies of scribal habits, however, fail to settle long-standing questions over textual relationships. The Western non-interpolations make the point. Despite the tendency of the scribe of 𝔓[75] to shorten his text, the longer readings—for other compelling reasons—are not automatically chosen. Moreover, like the scribe of 𝔓[75], a couple of the longer readings appear to harmonize in the direction of Matthew. Scribal activity may therefore serve as a model for understanding the emergence of textual corruption; it cannot decide particular cases. Textual decisions on the basis of the balance of probabilities remain our fate—even in the case of the papyri, where the fault lines of Luke's early textual history were already in place.

[102] Matt. 28: 17.

Table 7.1. Early Witnesses to Luke (2nd to mid-4th centuries)

G/A no.	*Editio princeps*	Date	Provenance	Size	Contents	Textual quality[a]
$\mathfrak{P}^{4}$	Suppl. Gr. 1120	III	Coptos	18 × 14	1:58–59; 1:62–2:1, 6–7; 3:8–4:2, 29–32, 34–5, 5:3–8; 5:30–6:16.	Normal[b]
$\mathfrak{P}^{7}$	F. 301	III/IV?		22 × 15	4:1–3	
$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$	P.Beatty I + P.Vindob.G. 31974	III	Aphroditipolis	20.5 × 22.5	6:31–41; 6:45–7:7; 9:26–41; 9:45–10:1, 6, 22; 10:26–11:1, 6–25, 28–46; 11:50–12:13, 18–37; 12:42–13:1, 6–24; 13:29–14:10, 17–33.	Free[c]
$\mathfrak{P}^{69}$	P. Oxy. 2383	III	Oxyrhynchus	8.5 × 5	22:41, 45–8, 58–61	Free
$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$	P.Bodmer XIV + XV	III	Jabal Abu Mana (Dishna)	13 × 26	3:18–22; 3:33–4:2; 4:34–5:10; 5:37–6:4; 6:10–7:32, 35–9, 41–3; 7:46–9:2; 9:4–17:15; 17:19–18:18; 22:4–24:53.	Strict
$\mathfrak{P}^{111}$	P. Oxy. 4495	III	Oxyrhynchus	4.8 × 2.9	17:11–13, 22–3	Strict

[a] Alands' categories are used for the sake of convention. Upgrades to the ratings for the text of Luke in $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ are noted. $\mathfrak{P}^{7}$ receives no ranking from the Alands, presumably because of its possible status as a patristic fragment.

[b] The text of Luke in $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ may be upgraded to 'strict' given its over 90% agreement with $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$–B.

[c] The text of Luke in $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ may be upgraded to 'normal' given its close alignment with Alexandrian witnesses—particularly, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$–B.

8

The Early Text of John*

Juan Chapa

It is commonplace to assert that the Gospel of John was the last Gospel to be written. Most likely this was the case. However, far more debated is determining how it was composed and used in the initial years following its composition. Although chance may have played a role in it, what we can be certain about is that the text of the Fourth Gospel is the best attested text from the second and third centuries. This can be said for two reasons. First, due to the volume of manuscripts and the extent of the transmitted text (there is no chapter of the Gospel of which we do not have a testimony prior to the large uncials of the fourth century); second, one codex has preserved practically the entire Fourth Gospel, and another manuscript partially preserves about two-thirds of the Gospel.[1]

Despite these two factors, our current evidence does not necessarily bring us any closer to the original text than in the case of other books of the New Testament. What the evidence does confirm is the diversification of the text associated with the copying process in early manuscripts. However, the extant manuscripts point to scribes, who in the process of copying, attempted to remain as faithful as possible to the exemplar. If they did not achieve their goal it might have been because (a) the scribes' intentions of accuracy did not always coincide with the quality of their copying and (b) there was not a uniform criterion on what a faithful copy should be.

The total number of manuscripts to be dealt with in this chapter depends on the dating assigned to them. Table 8.1 will note sixteen papyri and a

* I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Edwin Collado for his careful translation and to Prof. James Royse and Dr Peter Head for their helpful suggestions and criticism. Of course, all errors or shortcomings are exclusively mine.

[1] We should note that at times the description of the contents of a specific MS is misleading. The reference does not specify if the verses are attested in their totality, in part, or, as often is the case in a few words or letters.

Table 8.1. Early Witnesses to John (2nd to mid-4th centuries)

G/A no.	*Editio princeps*	Date	Provenance	Size*	Contents	Textual quality
$\mathfrak{P}^{52}$	P.Ryl. III 457	II mid (NA: II)	Oxyrhynchus?	[18 × 21.5]	18:31–3, 37–8	Normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{90}$	P.Oxy. L 3523	II	Oxyrhynchus	[12] × 16	18:36–9:7	Normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{66}$	P.Bodmer II + P.Köln V 214 + P.Chester Beatty s.n	*c.* 200	Jabal Abu Mana (Dishna)	14.2 × 16.2	1:1–6:11; 6:35–14:26, 29–30; 15:3; 16:2–6; 16:10–20:20, 22–3; 20:25–21:9	At least normal? Free (Aland-Aland)
$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$	P.Bodmer XIV + XV	III[1]	Jabal Abu Mana (Dishna)	13 × 26	*Luke 3–18, 22–4;* *John* 1:1–11:45, 48–57; 12:3–50; 13: 8–9; 14:8–29; 15:7–8	Strict
$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$	P.Beatty I + P.Vindob.G. 31974	III	Aphroditopolis	[20.5 × 25.5]	*Matt. 20, 21, 25, 26; Mark 4–9, 11, 12; Luke 6, 7, 9–14; John* 4:51–5:2, 21–25; 10:7–25; 10:29–11:11, 18–37,42–57; *Acts 4–17*	Free
$\mathfrak{P}^{95}$	P.Laur. inv.II/31 (*CE* 60, 1985)	III	Unknown	[12 × 24.5]	5:26–9, 36–8	Free
$\mathfrak{P}^{106}$	P.Oxy. LXV 4445	III	Oxyrhynchus	[12.5 × 23.5]	1:29–35, 40–6	Strict
$\mathfrak{P}^{107}$	P.Oxy. LXV 4446	III	Oxyrhynchus	[10.5 × 23]	17:1–2, 11	Normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{108}$	P.Oxy. LXV 4447	III	Oxyrhynchus	[14.5 × 18.5]	17:23–4; 18:1–5	Strict
$\mathfrak{P}^{109}$	P.Oxy. LXV 4448	III	Oxyrhynchus	[12 × 24]	21:18–20, 23–5	Strict
$\mathfrak{P}^{119}$	P.Oxy. LXXI 4803	III	Oxyrhynchus	[14 × 25]	1:21–8, 38–44	
$\mathfrak{P}^{121}$	P.Oxy. LXXI 4805	III	Oxyrhynchus	[12 × 28]	19:17–18, 25–26	
$\mathfrak{P}^{5}$	P.Oxy. II 208 + XV 1781	III	Oxyrhynchus	[12.5 × 25]	1:23–31, 33–40; 16:14–30; 20:11–17, 19–20, 22–25	Normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{39}$	P.Oxy. XV 1780	III	Oxyrhynchus	[16] × 25.6	8:14–22	Strict
$\mathfrak{P}^{22}$	P.Oxy. × 1228	III end (NA: III)	Oxyrhynchus	roll	15:25–16:2, 21–32	At least normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{28}$	P.Oxy. XIII 1596	III-IV (NA: III)	Oxyrhynchus	[12.5 × 20.5]	6:8–12, 17–22	Normal
0162	P.Oxy. VI 847	III/IV	Oxyrhynchus	15 × 16	2:11–22	Normal

*Measurements are given in cm. Those in parenthesis refer to reconstructed size.

parchment of the Gospel of John of which there is a general consensus that they were copied before the great uncials.[2] I exclude from the list $\mathfrak{P}^{80}$, for I consider it to be from a later date.[3]

LIMITS AND POSSIBILITIES

The evaluation of the state of transmission of the text of John in the early stages is dependent upon geographical and temporal limitations, as well as upon the extent of the text preserved.

All the direct extant witnesses of the text of the Fourth Gospel come from Egypt and most of them come from Oxyrhynchus, which is the location where the vast majority of the early biblical texts have been found.[4] However, the best preserved manuscripts come from Jabal Abu Manna (Dishna), as well as the Fayyum. Nevertheless, we cannot identify with certainty the location from which they originate. The textual variants potentially suggest a diversity of places of provenance.

The majority of our texts are dated from the third century. Only two ($\mathfrak{P}^{52}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{90}$) are from the second century, although we cannot totally exclude that two others were copied towards the end of this century ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$). Two manuscripts ($\mathfrak{P}^{28}$ and 0162) were probably copied towards the end of the third century or beginning of the fourth.[5]

The majority of our witnesses have been preserved in a very fragmentary state and transmit a small portion of the text of the Gospel. As has been said,

[2] For more general information and reference to catalogues see Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB): http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/. Also see Juan Chapa, 'Los papiros más antiguos del Evangelio de Juan: Breve descripción', *EstBib* 66 (2008): 55–74.

[3] It deals with a fragment of unknown origin with part of the text of John 3: 34 followed by a *hermeneia*. *Ed. pr.* dated it in the 3rd cent. E. G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 150, in the 5th/6th cent. For more dating information see W. J. Elliott and D. C. Parker, *The New Testament in Greek*, iv. *The Gospel According to St. John,* 1. *The Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 1995 = IGNTP), 18. The use of a Christogram points to a post-Constantinian period. See M. Choat, *Belief and Cult in Fourth-Century Papyri* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 116–18, with bibliography. *Ed. pr.* compares $\mathfrak{P}^{80}$ with P.Flor. II 48. But the hand of $\mathfrak{P}^{80}$ is closer to the documentary hand of the end of the 4th cent. or beginning of 5th, comparable to Cairo Menander (second half of the 5th cent.): see G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period* (London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 16b.

[4] See the various studies of E. J. Epp, *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 497–520, 521–50, and 743–801. Cf. also A. Luijendijk, *Greetings in the Lord* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008) and Peter J. Parsons, *The City of the Sharp-Nosed Fish* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007), 193–210.

[5] IGNTP, which offers a transcription of the text with critical apparatus and photographs of all the papyri of John publ. until 1995 (the last being $\mathfrak{P}^{95}$), gives the dates that have been proposed for the various MSS (pages 17–18).

there is only one manuscript which transmits practically the entire Gospel ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$) and another two-thirds ($\mathfrak{P}^{75}$). Except for $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, which preserves remnants of three leaves, and $\mathfrak{P}^{5}$, which consists of two fragments corresponding to three leaves (among them the second and the second-to-last leaves of the Gospel), the remaining witnesses consist of single leaves of their codices (except $\mathfrak{P}^{22}$, which is a roll). We may assume, however, that they originally belonged to codices that contained the entire Gospel.

The best attested portion of text is 10: 29–11: 11 ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$). The chapter that is supported by the greatest number of witnesses is John 1 ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{5}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{106}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{119}$). None of our earliest manuscripts attests to the *Pericope Adulterae* (7: 53–8: 11).[6] In turn, there are no early witnesses to the absence of John 21 (which is attested in $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{109}$).

There are no two manuscripts of John that are exactly alike in every place. Approximately eighty years after its composition, the text presents a diversity of variations. This is confirmed by $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, which trace back to texts which surely were in circulation in the last decades of the second century.

In spite of these limitations, the study of the papyri allows us to gain a certain idea of how the text of John was transmitted in a region with a large Christian presence, of the habits of those who copied it, as well as the similarity this text bears to what might be the original text of John.

THE TWO MAJOR WITNESSES

An Informal Recension?

$\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ is the most important witness to the Gospel of John.[7] It testifies to the totality of the work except for 6: 12–34 and some of the final verses of the Gospel.[8] The most reasonable dating of $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, and the opinion of the consensus, is around the year 200, although it has met with resistance by some who desire to have it dated to the first half or mid-way through the second century. Some have argued for it to be dated to the first half of the third century.[9]

[6] For a *status quaestionis* see David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 342–3, with bibliography. Cf. also C. Keith, *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 119–40.

[7] For many of the questions treated here and further bibliography see the study of James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), esp. 399–544.

[8] Missing in the original are 5: 4, 7: 53–8: 11 (*Pericope Adulterae*), and 16: 15. From 14: 26 until the end of the passage it is seriously damaged, being in certain places very fragmentary.

[9] For the various proposed dates see IGNTP 18. Turner is blunt: '$\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ should be assigned to *c.* AD 200–250, not to c. ii' (*Typology*, 95).

The preserved text corresponds to seventy-five leaves of a codex that originally had thirty-nine folded folios (seventy-eight leaves = one hundred and fifty-six pages). The book reveals careful preparation. The pages are numbered on the upper right-hand side. The writing is a stylized majuscule, medium-size, rounded, written slowly and rather flat, and generally bilinear—the work of a competent scribe, who was probably a Christian.[10] It presents itacism and other current orthographic variations. It also contains punctuation and reading aids (trema, apostrophe, rough breathings).

The text is noteworthy for its high number of corrections. In the pages that have been preserved, 465 corrections have been noted.[11] The text has been corrected using a variety of techniques[12] and it is unclear whether or not they are the work of the same hand.[13] Some corrections were done by the scribe as he copied the text; however there are others that seem to have been done after the copy was finished. The majority (341 = 73.5%) demonstrate a desire on behalf of the scribe and/or corrector to transmit the readings of the *Vorlage*. In other cases (about 100) both the original reading and its corrected form have textual support in other manuscripts, which suggests they represent different textual traditions and that the scribe and/or corrector shifted from one reading to another upon checking their text in relation to a second *Vorlage*.[14]

A writing containing so many corrections indicates a degree of carelessness, at least initially, and little preoccupation with formality. This has led to a discussion on the accuracy of copying, intention, efficiency, and habits of the scribe.[15] Royse concludes in his monumental and meticulous study that 𝔓[66],

[10] Harmonizations to parallels and to general usage of the New Testament, the use of *nomina sacra* and staurogram, suggest that the scribe was a Christian. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 500–3, and P. M. Head, 'Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies in Singular Readings in P. Bodmer II (P66)', in H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, eds., *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies?* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 55–74.

[11] According to the analysis in Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 409. Parker, *An Introduction*, 141, signals that it contains a correction every 333 words, or 30 in every 1,000 words. Before Royse, the corrections had been treated mainly by G. D. Fee, 'The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission', *NovT* 7 (1964–5): 247–57, and *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66)* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968), 57–75.

[12] On the various manners (erasure, rewriting, marginal addition, etc.) see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 412–13. See also E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World,* 2nd edn. rev. and enl. P. J. Parsons (London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 108.

[13] In the judgment of Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 414, only the correction of 13: 19a has been done by a second hand (for IGNTP 6, also 14: 22). However, in my opinion, there are numerous corrections from a hand other than that of the scribe, and from that of 13: 19a. Compare e.g. the 'original' hand with that of the corrections in 1: 42, 2: 12, 3: 17, 31, 6: 1, 14: 12, and, specifically, with the way the upsilon, kappa, sigma are written. P. W. Comfort and D. P. Barrett, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 2nd edn. (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2001), 386–7, refer to the masters thesis by Karyn Berner, who distinguishes three hands.

[14] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 461–2.

[15] Ibid. 399–544. The various views on the copyist, from 'careless and ineffective' (E. C. Colwell, 'Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P45, P66, P75', in *Studies in Methodology in*

as a corrected document, can be considered a manuscript which transmits a copy which is faithful to its exemplar.[16] It contains very few nonsense readings and few orthographic singular readings (many of the corrections imply small orthographic changes, which indicates scribal concern for orthography, although the papyrus generally has various kinds of itacistic spellings). Omissions are usually short. Transpositions are also numerous and sometimes corrected. The harmonizations are frequent especially to the immediate context, although there are cases of harmonizations to parallel passages or to general usage of the New Testament. Some harsh readings have been smoothed over, especially to eliminate asyndeta.[17]

The character of the text itself is not clear. Basically, it contains an 'Alexandrian' text, joined with 'Western' and Byzantine readings.[18] The text is linked to the type of text to which 𝔓[75] and B belong (as a 'wild' member of this group), although not in a uniform manner, as there is variation in textual type from one part of the manuscript to another. The first five chapters present a closer relationship with the three major 'Alexandrian' witnesses 𝔓[75] B C. The rest of the manuscript demonstrates a mixture of 'Western' readings (abundant in chapters 6–7 and 11–12) and others which are found in the later Byzantine tradition.[19] While the corrections do not display any special inclination for or against a single MS or towards a specific textual tradition, they do depart from the 'Western' tradition and lean toward the Byzantine.[20] However, since these corrections cannot be classified solely as 'Alexandrian',

Textual Criticism of the New Testament (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 118), to 'flüchtiger und . . . gewissenhafter' (H. Greeven, 'Erwägungen zur synoptischen Textkritik', *NTS* 6 (1959–60), 282), and the different number of singular readings, from 482 (Colwell) to 128 (Royse), depend mainly on the judgment on who made the corrections and on analysis of the codex before or after the corrections. For a summary and a conciliatory perspective see Head, 'Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies', 60–3. For a discussion on the accuracy and copying technique see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 495–505.

16 Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 900–1. Although the likelihood of error increases as one ventures deeper into the MS, Royse's analysis shows that the scribe's rate of error (i.e. the frequency with which he creates singular readings) is on average 2.3 singular readings per page of the NA[27], a lower figure than other ancient papyri that also contain an extensive text (except 𝔓[75]). As has been said, for Royse almost all the corrections were made by the original scribe.

17 Ibid. 544.

18 Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 35; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 401. For Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 36–56, many of the readings seem secondary, creating a simpler text or a more common style of Greek. Birdsall thinks that the text is 'a mixture of good and bad, of primitive and recensional . . . Very few of its singular or subsingular readings commend themselves as possessing a *prima facie* claim to originality' (J. N. Birdsall, 'The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John', in *Collected Papers in Greek and Georgian Textual Criticism* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006), 70; repr. of *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960)).

19 Royse's analysis on the 'scribe's rate of error' coincides in part with the deterioration of the copying process. In 1: 1–6: 51 (perfectly conserved almost in its entirety) the fidelity of the text is greater, with a scribe's rate of error of 1.0. From 6: 52 until 14: 26 (again almost perfectly preserved) it is 2.2 and from 14: 29 to 21: 9 it is 5.7. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 495.

20 Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 70; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 470.

'Western', or Byzantine, we should assume that the scribe corrected his text to a mixed *Vorlage* or more than one *Vorlage*.[21]

Some distinctive variants are: *ουδεν* (1:3), *επ' αυτω* (3:15), *ο* before *προφητης* (7:52), omission of *ουκ* (9:27), *προ εμου* (10: 8), omission of *του θεου* (11: 4), *βληθησεται εξω* (12: 31), *παντα* (12: 32), *ει μη τους ποδας μονον νιψασθαι* (13: 10), omission of *ει ο θεος εδοξασθη εν αυτω* (13: 32), *ει εγνωκατε με* (14: 7), *αλλος* (without the article) (18: 15).[22]

From a theological point of view, the reading of *μονογενης* $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ (with no article stands out in 1: 18, in the place of *μονογενης υιος*, also omitting the article before *μονογενης*. It is possible that the omission of the article, typically 'Alexandrian', was intentional in order to avoid identifying Christ as 'the one and only God' and simply affirming that He is 'uniquely God'.[23] Nonetheless, the text of 𝔓[66] does not allow us to reach any definite conclusions as to the theological preferences of its scribe. Ehrman claims to have discovered these inclinations in certain cases. For example, he believes that the scribe desired to emphasize that Jesus was the Christ via the addition of *αληθως* in 1: 49, or that he tried to avoid adoptionistic interpretations by using *οτι* in the place of *ουχ* in 6: 42, or that he desired to prevent any potential docetic conception by omitting *ινα τελειωθη η γραφη* in 19: 28.[24] However, these variants are found in 𝔓[66] and were corrected later by the same scribe or by another hand. If they were introduced through theological purposes, we should thus have to assume that the 'correcting' hand (using perhaps a different *Vorlage*) was opposed to the 'orthodox corruption' and instead preferred the 'heterodox' reading. But this type of statement seems unduly precarious, especially when the possibility exists that the corrections were made by the same scribe.[25] The lack of a particular theological interest in 𝔓[66] is confirmed by Peter Head's study on some singular readings which are related to Christological variants and variants dealing with attitudes to Judaism.[26]

[21] Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 71. For Fee, the corrections have been made to smooth the text and make the Greek more intelligible (ibid. 73). However, Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 477–84, thinks that the scribe wanted to reproduce the readings that existed in the *Vorlage*.

[22] Given the great number of them I have limited myself to pointing out some noted by Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Freiburg: Herder, 1965), 163–7, and Birdsall, 'The Bodmer Papyrus', 70.

[23] B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York: OUP, 1993), 79.

[24] Ibid. 57, 160, and 194, respectively.

[25] Furthermore, these and other variants readings Ehrman notes can also be explained by other reasons. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 457 n. 324; 509 n. 578; 459; 509–10.

[26] 'Attempts to discern a theological agenda in the work of our scribe generally involve over-interpreting the variations and, in any case, result in contradictory tendencies. I think it is preferable to see these as more or less directionless variations on the part of our careless, but committed scribe' (Head, 'Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies', 73). He studies the following passages: 7: 52, 8: 42, 10: 33, 11: 4, 11: 34, 11: 39, 19: 5, 19: 28, 12: 11, 15: 25.

The Alands characterize 𝔓66 as a 'free' text,[27] but we can affirm that, in the manner in which we have received it, it reproduces with a great degree of faithfulness a typical 'Alexandrian' text. Although it seems that the scribe might have been careless at points as he copied from the *Vorlage*, thereby committing a series of errors, the later corrections to the original *Vorlage* and to a second *Vorlage* provide us with a second-century text of great value for our understanding of the earliest text of John, especially in the first five chapters.

The presence of so many corrections raises many questions as to the purpose for which it was copied. If it was used with a liturgical end in mind, we would have to think that concern for form was not invested with special importance, and worship was not yet directly associated with books whose presentation reflected the special nature of the text. In any case, the papyrus is very important for its antiquity and its peculiar recensional character. It reveals two ancient textual traditions and shows a concern to transmit a text responsibly.

A Careful Elegance

𝔓75 is a codex that contains most of the Gospel of Luke and almost the entire first fifteen chapters of the Gospel of John.[28] It comes from the same location as 𝔓66. However, there is a lack of scholarly consensus as to its dating. Although it is common for scholars to argue for the first half of the third century, others have proposed dates of the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, or between 225 and 275.[29]

The codex has an elongated shape and is composed of a single quire containing thirty-six folded folios (= one hundred and forty-four pages). It originally contained at least the Gospels of Luke and John.[30] The Gospel of John should have occupied fifty-seven pages (from page 87 to 144, the final page); unfortunately we only have remains of twenty. The codex does reveal a great deal of care as to its preparation. The writing is in majuscule script, upright, elegant, and clear, produced by a professional scribe. In the second half of the codex the script is more dense than in the first, as the scribe begins

[27] K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 100.

[28] From 5: 23 to 8: 22 and from 10: 14 to 15: 8 there is uneven damage. For an extended bibliography as to the questions treated here see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 615–704.

[29] For the various proposed dates see IGNTP 18.

[30] The codex preserves the name of the gospel of Luke at its conclusion and the gospel of John's initial title. T. C. Skeat, 'The Origin of the Christian Codex', *ZPE* 102 (1994): 263–8, has proposed that originally the codex contained the four Gospels.

to write progressively smaller, increasing the number of letters per line.[31] The scribe does use punctuation marks, but not in a regular manner.[32]

The manuscript stands out for the great care with which it was copied. The scribe intended to be painstaking and faithful in reproducing the text. Colwell affirms that 'his impulse to improve style is for the most part defeated by the obligation to make the exact copy'.[33] Royse softens this statement and notes that 𝔓75 achieves a level of faithfulness that is praiseworthy, but without straying too far from 𝔓66 and 𝔓45. The scribe commits many mistakes of orthography and produces many nonsense readings, mainly by slips of one or two letters.[34]

Royse's analysis demonstrates that the codex contains seventy-eight singular readings in John (from a total of 166 in Luke and John) and fifty-five corrections (of a total of 116). Almost all the corrections have been made by the original scribe.[35] The majority are corrections of mere blunders and most of them favour the text found in B (or B*). There seems to be no sign of control by another person. It does not seem that there was an intent to revise the text in relation to another exemplar nor any attempt at a systematic correction.[36]

Royse concludes that 𝔓75 presents a low frequency of additions.[37] The scribe omits more than three times as often as he adds. The additions as well as the omissions are habitually short, as are the few examples of transpositions. Harmonization is responsible for several singular readings in the manuscript, the most frequent being harmonization to the immediate context (especially in John). However, there are also harmonizations to parallels and two to general usage. It does not seem that the scribe had a clear tendency to improve the text from a grammatical or stylistic point of view, although he tended to write a singular verb in the place of the plural when the subject had not yet been expressed. Royse's analysis shows that the scribe produced a faithful copy with a low rate of error.[38]

31 Turner, *Typology*, 74 and 86.

32 As in 𝔓66, the divisions of the text are analogous to those of W and D (although in these MSS they are much more frequent). Cf. L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 180.

33 Colwell, 'Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits', 121. Of the same opinion is Comfort and Barrett, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament*, 505.

34 Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 656–9 and 704.

35 There are five corrections (three in Luke and two in John) that seem to come via a later hand by a reader who noted the error, as well as several marginalia glosses in cursive hand from the 4th or 5th cent. Cf. ibid. 625–32, 645–6; *ed. pr.* 23–4.

36 Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 630–1.

37 For this summary, I follow ibid. 704.

38 According to ibid. 656, 901, in John the total is 2.1 singular readings per page of NA[27]. The 'rate of error' in 1: 1–5: 23 is 1.5, in 5: 24–8: 21 it is 3.2, in 8: 22–10: 14 it is 0.6, and in 10: 15–14: 26 it is 3.1. The deterioration in these last two sections, perhaps from fatigue or lack of attention, makes it impossible to establish any clear tendencies on the part of the scribe.

Of all the ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, 𝔓^{75} and B present the most intimate relationship. 𝔓^{75} is closer to B than any other manuscript (the agreement between B and 𝔓^{75} in John is 92 percent, reaching a high of 96 percent in chapter 12). Both seem to originate from a common ancestor (B is not a copy of 𝔓^{75}), which should date back at least to the second century, but has not been preserved.[39]

An interesting variant is the reading *ο ποιμην* in the place of *η θυρα* in 10: 7 (also found in the Sahidic version). Although, it has been proposed that the reading in 𝔓^{75} is the original, the majority of commentators believe that it is an assimilation to the context.[40] Other detectable variants are: punctuation mark after *ουδεν εν* (1: 3); *εν αυτω* (3: 15); omission of *ετι* (4: 35); omission of 4: 37 in its entirety; omission from *ο δε* until *ο ιησους* in 9: 38–9; omission of *προ εμου* (10: 8); *εκβληθησεται εξω* (12: 31).[41]

From a theological point of view, 𝔓^{75} does not offer any controversial readings. In 1: 18 it reads $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ in the place of *υιος*, but it attests the reading of *ο μονογενης* (with the article).[42] In 10: 7–8 it softens Jesus affirmation towards those who 'came before him' omitting *προ εμου*.[43] Ehrman suggests that the addition of *και* in 14: 9 might emphasize the distinction between Christ and the Father[44] and Schnackenburg wonders whether the punctuation mark in 1: 3 might indicate an early anti-Gnostic tendency.[45] Finally, Mikeal C. Parsons sees a theological intention in 2: 15 (*ως* would have been added before *φραγελλιον* to avoid a reference to Jesus as a violent Lord) and 8: 57 (*αβρααμ εορακεν σε* in the place of *αβρααμ εωρακας* to explain the affirmation: 'Before Abraham was, I am.').[46] However, the supposed evidence he cites in this and other cases does not seem sufficiently solid to establish a theological intention on the part of the scribe.[47]

[39] C. L. Porter, 'Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus', *JBL* 81 (1962): 363–76; C. M. Martini, *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966), 58–65; S. A. Edwards, 'P75 under the Magnifying Glass', *NovT* 18 (1976): 190–212; G. D. Fee, 'P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria', in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 251–6; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 616–19, with more bibliography.

[40] On the discussion see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 694–5.

[41] Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 163–6.

[42] Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 79.

[43] Ibid. 240.

[44] Ibid. 264–5.

[45] Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 163.

[46] M. C. Parsons, 'A Christological Tendency in P75', *JBL* 105 (1986): 463–79, esp. 474–5.

[47] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 703, also demonstrating it in other examples from Luke that Parsons furnishes.

In sum, the papyrus stands out due to its quality, the faithfulness of the copyist, and its relationship to B. In regard to the quality of the text and its transmission, 𝔓75 can safely be classified as 'strict'.[48]

FRAGMENTS

A Liberal Scribe

𝔓45 emerges among the most fragmented texts. Although it only preserves remnants of three pages corresponding to the Gospel of John, it is possible to gather information as to the habits of the scribe who copied it by examining what has been conserved from other books contained in the MS (Gospels and Acts).[49] The codex is dated unanimously to the third century, fluctuating between the first and second half of the century. An intermediate date of around 250 is commonly accepted.[50]

The Gospel of John would have occupied thirty-eight pages (from page 50 to 87) of the 224 (fifty-six folded folios) that would have contained the four Gospels.[51] The writing is a small majuscule, but very clear, sloping to the right, with a tendency to form square angles, generally bilinear, and produced by a professional scribe.[52]

𝔓45 is undisciplined. Colwell is of the opinion that the scribe did not intend to reproduce his source exactly: he copied the text phrase by phrase and clause by clause, seeing through the language to its idea-content. As a result, the scribe copied with liberty (harmonizing, smoothing out, substituting almost at a whim), favouring concision and brevity, preoccupied in communicating the significance of the text over and against an exact fidelity to the exemplar being

[48] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 101.

[49] For more information and bibliography see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 103–97, and B. Aland, 'Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papyri, demonstriert am Johannesevangelium', in W. Weren and D.-A. Koch, eds., *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism New Testament* (Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2005), 19–38.

[50] For the various proposed dates see IGNTP 17.

[51] Initially, the text of John of P. Chester-Beatty was represented by fragments of only two leaves corresponding to chs. 10 and 11. T. C. Skeat and B. C. McGing, 'Notes on Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus I (Gospels and Acts)', *Herm* 150 (1991): 21–5, publ. additional fragments corresponding to chs. 4 and 5. As it is known, P45 presents the so-called Western order of the Gospels, that appears in W, D, and various MSS of the *Vetus Latina*: Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark.

[52] It is speculated that, given the small size of the letters, the codex was prepared not for public/liturgical reading but for private use. There are no data in one direction or the other, but we cannot exclude liturgical use. The size of the writing could be accounted for by the necessity of including the Gospels and Acts in one single codex. Cf. Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 174–7.

copied. 𝔓[45], then, would contain a text not subject to external controls.[53] Royse considers the opinion of Colwell in this regard as exaggerated and argues that, even if the scribe occasionally departed from the text being copied, these changes must be viewed in the broader context of the scribe's intent to reproduce a faithful copy.[54] Aland has a similar opinion and argues that the copying of 𝔓[45] is 'both intelligent and liberal: intelligent, because the sense of the exemplar is quickly grasped and in essence precisely reproduced; and liberal, because involved expressions and repetitious words are simplified or dropped'.[55]

John contains four corrections (from a total of fourteen in the codex, two of which seem to be second hand: Matt. 25: 42 and Acts 7: 12). The corrections are the work of the original scribe, who, at a later point, realized he had departed from the *Vorlage*. There is no evidence that he compared the manuscript to a different exemplar.[56]

Royse concludes that the scribe for 𝔓[45] was concerned to produce a readable text and did so practically without any corrections of his own or from another person.[57] As a consequence, there are few nonsense readings, few corrections, and few obvious errors. At times, the text being copied is simplified and parts are omitted, although it is not clear if this is deliberate or accidental. A few errors appear to be due to harmonization to parallels, but more often they are due to harmonization to the immediate context. In addition, the scribe made classic stylistic and grammatical improvements to the text.

The accuracy to the original copy decreases in John. However, due to the lack of extensive text available we cannot be certain that such changes are not due to the scribe becoming progressively more careless as he produced his copy. According to Royse, there are twenty-nine singular readings in John (of a total of 227).[58]

𝔓[45] does not line up well with any of the large-uncial texts (except for W in Mark, where the text has been described as 'Caesarean').[59] The text of the Fourth Gospel is at a mid-way point between the 'Alexandrian' and the 'Western' MSS, making it a witness to the existence in Egypt during the first half of the third century of a type of text distinct from that which is

[53] Colwell, 'Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits', 117–19.

[54] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 124.

[55] B. Aland, 'The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History', in C. Horton, ed., *The Earliest Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 112. See also Aland, 'Der textkritische', 27–33.

[56] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 114–18.

[57] For this and what follows, ibid. 197.

[58] According to Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 123 and 900–1, the overall rate of error in John is 8.6 per page in the NA[27], which is notably higher than other MSS.

[59] On the discussion see Epp, *Perspectives*, 68–73 and 373–4, for whom 𝔓[45]–W cannot regarded as 'Caesarean' in Mark, but rather constitutes its own group, with further developments in f[13]. And see now Larry W. Hurtado, ed., *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 9–11.

encountered predominantly in B. There is a strong presence of readings found in the early authorities that are grouped as 'Western', although it has none of the larger divergences found in some of those witnesses.[60] Some notable variants are the omissions of *προ εμου* (10: 8), *παλιν* (10: 31), *εκει* (10: 42), and *εκειθεν* (11: 54); and the reading of *ηρεν* instead of *αιρει* (10: 18).[61]

From a theological point of view, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ does not present relevant variants. We can note that in 11: 4 it substitutes *θεου* for *αυτου* ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ omits either) along with the *Vetus Latina* and the Coptic versions. This passage, as well as 5: 25, are the only places in John in which Jesus directly applies the title 'Son of God' to himself (10: 36 being a quoted psalm).[62] Significant omissions include *και η ζωη* in 11: 25, and those of 10: 34–5, where *υμων* and the omission of *προς ους ο λογος του θεου εγενετο* and *η γραφη* perhaps reflect a personal perception of the Jewish Law on the part of the scribe (the Law is no longer 'our law').

$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ does not have a high number of variants that coincide with a large number of witnesses. For Aland, the *Vorlage* was already contaminated in relation to the hypothetical initial text, although the scribe creates new variations, demonstrating the 'unordentliche' liberty of the early tradition.[63] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ is thought to transmit a 'free' text.[64]

Other Fragments

Due to space limitations, we will only note a few characteristics of the most relevant of the remaining extant fragments.[65]

The prominence of $\mathfrak{P}^{52}$ lies mainly in its date, as the earliest witness of the New Testament.[66] Its contribution to our knowledge of the early text of John is very

[60] F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, ii. *The Gospel and Acts, Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1933), p. xvii. See also n. 79 below.

[61] Aland, 'Der textkritische', 27–33, 36; Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 163.

[62] Cf. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 160.

[63] Aland, 'Der textkritische', 32–3.

[64] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 99; B. Aland, 'Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments', in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 6–10.

[65] As to the issue of the text transmitted and scribal habits, see Aland, 'Der textkritische', 19–38; 'Kriterien', 1–13; P. M. Head, 'The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John', *Bib* 85 (2004): 399–408; J. K. Elliott, 'Four New Papyri Containing the Fourth Gospel and their Relevance for the Apparatus Criticus', *JTS* 59 (2008): 674–8.

[66] A date in the middle or second half of the 2nd cent. might be possible, but it should be taken cautiously. See B. Nongbri, 'The Use and Abuse of $\mathfrak{P}^{52}$: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel', *HTR* 98 (2005): 23–48. See also Bagnall's remarks on dating the earliest papyri: Roger S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 1–24. Besides the debate on its dating, much of the discussion on this papyrus has focused

limited due to its fragmentary character. The papyrus might have read παλιν before εις το πραιτωριον in 18: 33. It might have also omitted the second εις τουτο in 18: 37. Based on stichometric restorations it has been qualified as a 'normal text'.[67]

𝔓⁹⁰ is, along with 𝔓⁵², another papyrus of John that stands out for its age. In 18: 37 the word order is συ ει against ει συ in the rest of MSS. In 19: 6 it omits the second σταυρωσον and adds αυτον. These variants, attested elsewhere, do not allow us to deduce if they were created by the scribe or if they were already in the *Vorlage*. For Barbara Aland the text is clearly based upon the hypothetical initial text.[68]

𝔓⁵ is conspicuous for the tendency of its scribe towards brevity. This can be deduced especially in its omission of the articles, unnecessary pronouns, conjunctions, etc. It is characterized by various corrections added to the text perhaps by the same scribe (or by a corrector contemporary with the scribe), which also affect the orthographic errors caused by pronunciation. In addition, there is a case of the omission of nine words at 16: 23–4 that has been corrected at the bottom of the page, perhaps by another hand contemporary to the original scribe.[69] The papyrus probably omitted αυτου after μαθηται in 1: 37 and might have also omitted πετρου in 1: 40 and substituted διδασκαλε for κυριε in 20: 16. It is considered to be an example of a 'normal' text.[70]

𝔓¹⁰⁶, 𝔓¹⁰⁷ and 𝔓¹⁰⁹ testify some interesting variants: 𝔓¹⁰⁶, which usually aligns with 𝔓⁶⁶, 𝔓⁷⁵ and B, might attest the earliest witness of εκλεκτος for υιος in 1: 34 (the reading is uncertain, but some faint traces of ε after εστιν seem to exclude υιος);[71] 𝔓¹⁰⁷, which stands out because of its 'Western' character, appears to add ουκετι ειμι εν τω κοσμω και εν τω κοσμω ειμι before πατερ in 17: 11; 𝔓¹⁰⁹ reads αλλοι ζωσουσιν και οισουσιν σε in 21: 18. These three variants proceed from fragments that seem to have few careless mistakes, which tentatively suggests that they were not created by the scribes, but were already contained in their *Vorlage*.[72]

on its possible use of *nomina sacra*, as the fragment does not preserve words which were usually abbreviated as such. If we look at other manuscripts of the same time frame, the presumption is in favour of its having been used, but the papyrus does not permit us to establish this. For the details and evaluation of the discussion see Thomas J. Kraus, 'Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Chances and Limitations', in T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, eds., *Early Christian Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1–38.

67 Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 99.

68 Aland, 'Der textkritische', 23–4, 37.

69 For more details see Head, 'Habits of New Testament Copyists', 404–5.

70 Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 96; Aland, 'Der textkritische', 24–6.

71 In a recent study Tze-Ming Quek, 'A Text-Critical Study of John 1.34', *NTS* 55 (2009): 22–34, believes that there are reasons to consider it original. But he argues that the reading υιος is not convincing as serving anti-adoptionist controversies (as Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 69–70, thinks). See also Aland, 'Der textkritische', 33–4; 'Kriterien', 6–7.

72 Aland, 'Der textkritische', 36.

𝔓39 stands out due to its large and beautiful script of the biblical type.[73] The text is noticeable for its correlation with 𝔓75 B W and others, reproducing a *Vorlage* that is very faithful to the hypothetical initial text.[74] According to Aland, this is a good example of how in the third century there were papyri that perfectly preserved the *Ausgangstext*[75] and has been qualified as a 'strict text'.[76]

𝔓95 is situated at the other extreme alongside 𝔓45.[77]

CONCLUSION: A RATHER 'NORMAL' TEXT

The early period of the transmission of the Gospels presents insoluble problems. The evidence is so limited and the variables are so many that all our conclusions must be offered with caution and a healthy dose of scepticism.[78] Such an approach is necessary because we do not know to what extent these manuscripts are representative of the situation of the text of John in the early period. All our manuscripts of John originate from Egypt and we are unaware if the text of John in other places would be similar to the text preserved in our extant papyri. However, even with such considerations in mind, we can arrive at some provisional conclusions:

1. The oldest manuscripts of John testify, on the whole, to a typical 'Alexandrian' text. This is not surprising if one keeps in mind the place from which they originate (although they might not have been written there).[79]
2. As a general principle, we can say that the surviving MSS are based on a text that is close to the original as it is presented hypothetically in NA. The two most extensive papyri manifest this, each in their own manner. The scribe responsible for 𝔓75 is very faithful to his *Vorlage*, taking almost

[73] There is not much agreement on its date (early 3rd cent., unlikely to be later than the 4th cent., 3rd cent., etc.). See e.g. A. Luijendijk, 'Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus', *VC* 64 (2010): 247. I am inclined to Turner's dating, 'late iii' (*Typology*, 147).

[74] Some discussion on its readings can be found at Maurice A. Robinson, review of P. W. Comfort and D. P. Barrett, eds. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, *TC* 6 (2001): 39–50: http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/vol07–toc.html.

[75] Aland, 'Der textkritische', 21.

[76] Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 98.

[77] Aland, 'Der textkritische', 37.

[78] See the final reflections in Parker's manual, *An Introduction*, 348–9, and the frequent calls by the author to a sober agnosticism with respect to many points in the history of the New Testament text.

[79] Aland, 'Der textkritische', 37, warns that it is not strange that the fragmentary texts are frequently supported by MSS of a 'Western' character (D ℵ* Θ f113). This is not because the fragments have a 'Western' character, but because the noted witnesses (D ℵ* Θ f1,13 etc.) preserve elements of the initial text that were copied quickly and with a certain negligence. This is why we find these witnesses (and no Byzantine MSS) among the early papyri.

no liberties. The papyrus reveals that the typical 'Alexandrian' text characteristic of the codices from the fourth century (B and Sinaiticus) was common in Egypt towards the end of the second century or beginning of the third in a relatively pure form. For its part, $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, after undergoing corrections, is faithful to the textual tradition which it copies, especially in its first five chapters.

3. Not as much can be said about the text available in the fragments and the degree of accuracy with which it was copied. But the variations in these fragments—both clear and reconstructed—are not much different from those found in our two most extensive manuscripts. The exception is $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ (and $\mathfrak{P}^{95}$ to the extent that it is possible to judge), which copies with great liberty and testifies to several variations that were possibly transmitted from other manuscripts. In any case, there are few important variants in relation to the number of verses attested to in these fragments.[80]
4. The benefit of the doubt lies with the scribes who copied these manuscripts; as corresponds to their profession, they desired to reproduce the text, even if they were more or less careful in doing so and even if each did so in different ways (with great fidelity, as for example $\mathfrak{P}^{39}$ or $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, or freely, as $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{95}$).[81] There is no evidence as to a deliberate, conscious, attempt to interpret or alter it. Most variants arise through negligence due to the speed at which the copy was produced and lapses of attention. The differences between texts, if they were even perceived by the scribes or hearers, were insignificant. Surely, they did not believe that those errors were very serious, especially when they were able to be overcome by the reader.[82]

An evaluation of the early text of John does not allow for much precision. However, the manuscripts studied do not point to an uncontrolled textual tradition. Lacking any proof of such recensional work as occurred in scriptoria of later periods, it is interesting to ascertain that at the beginning of the third century, at least in Oxyrhynchus (the place where the vast majority of Johannine papyri come from), there seems to exist a measure of control. This is suggested by the work of Bishop Sotas, who, among other things, was in charge of the production of books with educational and possibly liturgical ends in mind.[83] Perhaps we cannot speak of a scriptorium in the style of those which

[80] Aland, 'Der textkritische', 37.

[81] See summaries in Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 197, 544, 704; Aland 'The Significance', 108–9, and Larry W. Hurtado, 'The New Testament in the Second Century: Text, Collections and Canon', in J. W. Childers and D. C. Parker, eds., *Transmission and Reception* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006), 4–14.

[82] Aland, 'The Significance', 117–18.

[83] The existence in Oxyrhynchus of a scriptorium where the transcribing of classical works took place makes Luijendijk, *Greetings in the Lord*, 144–51, esp. 150, think that something analogous might have existed for Christians.

later become known, but we can at least say that it is not improbable that someone exercised some level of control over the person or persons who copied these books.[84]

Obviously, we have moved into a territory where the evidence is tenuous. However, the data we have accumulated coincide and correlate with what is known about the communities of this period. They were liturgical communities. The role the texts played in the liturgy makes one think the communities knew these texts well, accepted them, copied them, respected them, and had no desire to alter them. The Gospel of John belongs, without a doubt, to this group of texts.

[84] See Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 187. In this line and in opposition to networks of private scribes see Ulrich Schmid, review of K.Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*, *TC* 7 (2002): 14: http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/vol07–toc.html.

9

The Early Text of Acts

Christopher Tuckett

INTRODUCTION

The number of early manuscripts of Acts which survive is relatively small: if 'early' means prior to the great uncials ℵ and B, probably only seven manuscripts come into consideration: $\mathfrak{P}^{29}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{53}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{91}$ and 0189. As with Christian manuscripts from this period generally, almost all are papyri.[1] Surviving early manuscripts of Acts are thus not very numerous.[2]

The extant manuscripts are all fragmentary. The individual pages all have lacunae, and most cover only a very small amount of text (with the exception of P^{45}, they only consist of a single page or part of a page each). One should then be aware of the methodological problems which inevitably arise.

First, the small amount of text in a fragmentary papyrus inevitably means that we can only compare its text with other manuscripts across a small range. Especially in text-critical study of Acts, there has been enormous discussion of the 'Western' (and correspondingly the 'Alexandrian') text.[3] Very often

[1] The exception here is 0189 which is written on parchment. One needs to remember that not all early MSS are written on papyrus, but conversely, not all papyri are early. The main interest of this volume is in the textual history of NT texts prior to the great 4th-century uncials. The focus of attention is thus mostly on (some!) papyri MSS; but 0189 (3rd cent.) also provides important data. Other papyri MSS of Acts include $\mathfrak{P}^{8}$ (4th cent.), $\mathfrak{P}^{56}$ (5th cent.), $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$ (7th cent.), $\mathfrak{P}^{112}$ (5th cent.), and $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ (5th cent.): these are not treated here because of their date. There is thus no space here to discuss the very recently published text of $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ which has considerable text-critical interest.

[2] It would be tempting to deduce that Acts was copied relatively rarely in the earliest period. However, as has often been noted, the surviving papyrus evidence is not necessarily representative of the global situation in early Christianity. Nearly all the extant papyri come from Egypt and witness at most to the situation there; and what has survived through to the present—*and* been found!—does not necessarily represent the totality of what was produced at the time.

[3] I use the terms 'Western' and 'Alexandrian' to refer to the forms of the text found primarily in codex D and in ℵ B respectively. These descriptions are of course problematic (esp. the adjective 'Western'), though their continued use in scholarly discussions perhaps justifies their

readings which are regarded as characteristically Western are seen in single verses with a text which seems to be an expansion relative to the Alexandrian text. For other parts of the text, the two textual traditions run closely parallel. In discussion of early papyrus texts, one question which inevitably arises is whether the text in question can be seen to align more closely with the Western or Alexandrian textual tradition. However, the extant fragment may simply not include a passage where a distinctive Western reading occurs. The absence of any distinctive Western reading in a particular fragment may thus simply be due to the lack of any relevant data.

Second, the fragmentary nature of a papyrus text can lead to the extent of verbal agreement with other manuscripts appearing (in critical editions) to be greater than it necessarily is. All papyri have numerous lacunae in the section of text which they contain. Almost inevitably editors fill in lacunae on the basis of existing manuscripts (or editions) of that section of text. This in turn produces verbal 'agreement' with the manuscripts or editions used to fill out the lacunae. Clearly one can sometimes make reasonable conjectures about the extent of missing parts of a text on the basis of the space available; one can also identify possible textual affinities of a text on the basis of distinctive extant readings agreeing with other manuscripts. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that alleged 'agreement' between a papyrus fragment and other manuscripts is the result of a modern editor's conjecture rather than any actual reading of the fragment itself.

Surveys of the early papyri of Acts have been undertaken before,[4] and the present chapter makes no claims for great originality. Nevertheless, some of the studies undertaken have limitations and/or possible weaknesses. Aland's study treats only papyri thought to be 'Western' in some sense ($\mathfrak{P}^{29}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$); her study also argues for a detailed reconstruction of the history of the Western text which may be debatable at some points (see below). Elliott's study is rather shorter, with a wider remit than just Acts. His main aim is to compare the papyri with the text of D alone; he also appears to restrict attention to variants noted in the NA critical apparatus and/or passages included as *Teststellen* in the works of Aland. Porter provides a more comprehensive survey in one way; however, he restricts attention to similarities or differences between each papyrus manuscript and the readings of the uncials א B and D alone. In places where D is not extant, he compares the readings of

continued usage. For the sake of simplicity, I have generally not used inverted commas with either term, even though consistent use of these would not be unjustified!

[4] In the modern period, see esp. B. Aland, 'Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft des sog. westlichen Textes: Untersucht an der Apostelgeschichte', *ETL* 62 (1986): 5–65; J. K. Elliott, 'Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri', in D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, eds., *Codex Bezae* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 161–82; S. E. Porter, 'Developments in the Text of Acts Before the Major Codices' in T. Nicklas and M. Tilly, eds., *The Book of Acts as Church History* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), 31–67.

each papyrus with the reconstructed Western text in Clark's edition of Acts.[5] This probably gives too much status to a form of the text that is at times clearly a scholarly reconstruction (sometimes based on translations from Latin back into Greek and hence potentially somewhat imprecise in detailed wording). Further, comparison with two or three uncial manuscripts alone may be misleading without taking into account the possibility that each may occasionally give a slightly 'maverick' reading that is not representative of the 'family' to which it may belong.

In what follows, I consider each of the 'early' papyri (and 0189) in turn, though without giving a full discussion of all the readings in any of them, and certainly not in the case of 𝔓[45] (where in any case more detailed work has been undertaken by others, especially by Royse,[6] and hence will not be repeated here).

Two other preliminary points may be made here. In terms of method, there is the issue of how to determine the particular features of an individual manuscript. A pioneering study here was the essay of Colwell.[7] Colwell's approach was to focus on the 'singular' readings in a manuscript, that is, those with no other parallel in other extant manuscripts.[8] Colwell's method works well when a manuscript is reasonably extensive and his approach has been significantly developed by Royse's massive study. But both Colwell and Royse worked with papyri all containing an extensive amount of text. For smaller, highly fragmentary papyri containing very little text, a focus on singular readings alone may be less helpful. Hence Aland has argued that in such cases one should focus on all the readings contained.[9] Thus I will seek here to look at not just 'singular' readings in the papyri concerned.

Second, as already noted, a significant area of interest in text-critical study of Acts concerns the Western text. But what precisely is 'the' Western text? Very often it is (implicitly) equated with the text of codex D. But 'the' Western text may well have had a prehistory before it reached the stage of D;[10] further, there are some places where D is not extant and hence the problem arises of what other MSS may be used as possible witnesses to 'the' Western text. It is universally agreed that the margins of the Harclean Syriac (syr^{hmg}) provide

[5] A. C. Clark, *The Book of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933).

[6] J. R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

[7] E. C. Colwell, 'Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P[45], P[66], P[75]', in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 106–24.

[8] One can of course only say that a reading is singular in relation to other *known* MSS.

[9] B. Aland, 'Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments', in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 1–13.

[10] Cf. W. A. Strange, *The Problem of the Text of Acts* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), esp. ch. 2; also Aland, 'Entstehung', *passim*.

important evidence for possible Western readings, as well as other Latin manuscripts (e.g. gig).[11] Perhaps each case must be considered on its merits.

Finally, I have noted 'variants' in papyri by reference to the Nestle-Aland (NA) text as the 'given' 'base' text. This is not meant to prejudice decisions about originality but is intended simply to provide the data for identifying parts of the text in an accessible form.[12] References to a longer text in a papyrus ('𝔓^{xx} add'), a shorter one ('𝔓^{xx} om [omit]'), or an identical text ('𝔓^{xx} txt') are simply intended as convenient shorthands, without prejudging the relative priority of individual readings.

𝔓^{29} (= P.OXY.1597)

Editio pr.	Date	Provenance	Size	Acts	Quality[13]
Grenfell & Hunt[14]	III	Oxyrhynchus	5.5 × 2.8cm	26:7–8, 20	Free text, categ. I

Extant *nomina sacra*:[15] $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$

This small fragment exemplifies many of the methodological problems noted in the introduction to this chapter. There are five lines on each side, and each line consists of between five and ten letters. In order to determine possible affinities of the text form contained here, much depends on the way in which the missing parts of the extant lines are completed. Grenfell and Hunt argued that the text of the fragment 'seems to represent a very ancient Greek text akin to the "Western"' (p. 10), a view followed by a number of scholars since.[16] On the other hand, the 'Western' nature of the text has been questioned radically in recent years by, for example, Aland and Porter (see below).

[11] What other Greek MSS should be regarded as representatives of the Western text is debated, e.g. Aland, 'Entstehung', argues that 614, often taken to contain a Western text, has a text form which is *prior* to the main redactor who produced 'the' Western text as in D.

[12] The alternative is to take the readings of the papyrus as the given and note variants in other MSS from that: but it is then difficult to identify when the papyrus reading is unusual (or singular) without reference to the full text of the papyrus and space precludes giving that here.

[13] The 'categories' are those given for each MS in K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 96ff.

[14] B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, '1597: The Acts of the Apostles xxvi', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1919), 10–12, 10.

[15] In each case I give only the *nomina sacra* that are extant in the MS: others may be postulated by editors to fit available spaces in lacunae.

[16] e.g. J. H. Ropes, *The Beginnings of Christianity,* i. *The Acts of the Apostles*, 3. *The Text of Acts* (London: Macmillan, 1926), 235; B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 1968), 250; Strange, *Problem*, 190; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–8), 1.2. In the first edition of their book, the Alands categorized the papyrus as 'Related to D'.

Codex D is not extant in this part of Acts. Theories about the possibly 'Western' nature of the fragment are dependent on possible similarities of the text with some Latin MSS, which makes precision difficult; also some of the possible similarities depend on how the missing parts of the lines are (conjecturally) completed with the inherent dangers of circularity in the argument as noted earlier.

Very little of the text is extant; but even in the extant parts, there are a number of unusual readings, suggesting some carelessness in copying (or else an otherwise unevidenced text form). In what follows I give the readings as suggested in the *editio princeps*, though at some points the reading there is disputed.

26: 7 *λατρευον ελπιζει*] 𝔓29 *λατρευει εν ελπιδι*. Only the *ελπιδι* is extant: the indicative verb is postulated in a lacuna on the basis of *ελπιδι* probably replacing the verb *ελπιζει*.[17] It is possible that this shows agreement with gig (*deserviunt in spe*) and hence *may* be a Western reading.[18]

26: 7 *περι ης ελπιδος*] 𝔓29 *περι ης νυν*? The question mark is in the *editio princeps*: the reading is a conjecture to fill a large lacuna in the papyrus. It provides a partial parallel with gig again (*de qua spe nunc accusor*), and hence a further possible agreement with the Western textual tradition.[19] However, it may be better to reconstruct the line with *ελπιδος* rather than *νυν*, in line with all other witnesses.[20]

26: 7 *βασιλευ*] 𝔓29 A gig om. This is the suggestion of Grenfell and Hunt, though again it is in a lacuna. It is just as possible that the papyrus did in fact read *βασιλευ* here.[21]

26: 8 *τι απιστον κρινεται παρ υμιν*] 𝔓29 om.[22] A singular reading, perhaps due to scribal error.

26: 20 *πασαν τε την χωραν της Ιουδαιας και τοις εθνεσιν*] 𝔓29 *τη Ιουδαια και τοις εθνεσιν* (?). The reading is a conjecture, attempting to fill the space available with something sensible. It does though create 'a new variant' (i.e. a singular reading).[23]

17 Grenfell and Hunt, '1597', 11.

18 However, the agreement is solely with this one Latin (14th cent.) MS.

19 However, the 'agreement' with gig here (*νυν*/*nunc*) is the result of editorial suggestions about the completion of the line here, not of any extant readings in the papyrus; also gig does have *spe* here, implying a reading of *ελπιδος* in Greek.

20 So e.g. Aland, 'Entstehung', 42.

21 Ibid. In both the last two variants, Grenfell and Hunt are clearly influenced by their views on the length of the first line of the fragment, which they reconstruct to agree with the 'standard' text but which results in a relatively short line. However, it may be that the line lengths were more variable, or that there was an otherwise unknown variant in the first line of the fragment (as they themselves recognize).

22 There is clearly no space for this clause.

23 Grenfell and Hunt, '1597', 12. The NA reading, with the accusative *πασαν την χωραν*, has long been recognized as extremely difficult: cf. Clark, *Acts*, 382–3; Ropes, *Text*, 237; Barrett, *Acts*,

26: 20 απηγγελον] 𝔓^{29} εκηρυξα. This is a singular reading, though one Latin MS (h) has *praedicavi*, which *may* reflect a use of κηρυσσω.[24] But there is no clear difference in meaning between the two variants here.

Overall, 𝔓^{29} exhibits a number of interesting features, despite its very small size. It seems to have had a text that was shorter than that in virtually all extant Greek MSS at two points (cf. vv. 8, 20). However, *pace* the original editors, there is no clear evidence to see the papyrus as exhibiting a 'Western' form of the text. There is only one possible link with a 'Western' reading in the extant text, namely, v. 7 ελπιδι // gig *in spe*. That alone is scarcely enough to establish the textual affinity of the fragment as a whole. Other links with possible Western readings are at best tenuous, dependent on the conjectural completions of lacunae. The papyrus also has some singular readings. It thus has a form of the text displaying some considerable 'freedom' from any standardized text form. Rather than being 'related to D', 𝔓^{29} would seem to qualify well for a description as being somewhat 'free'.[25]

𝔓^{38} (= MICHIGAN PAPYRUS 1571)

Editio pr.	Date	Provenance	Size	Acts	Quality
New[26]	III	Unknown	*c.*14.5 × 8.9cm	18:27–19:6; 19:12–16	Free text, related to D, Categ. IV

Extant *nomina sacra*: $\overline{\iota\eta\nu}$ $\overline{\iota\eta\upsilon}$ $\overline{\chi\rho\nu}$ $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$

It is widely agreed that 𝔓^{38} shows striking agreements with the Western text at several points. The papyrus also forms the centrepiece for the theory of Barbara Aland that the Western text grew in stages: a 'Hauptredaktor', no earlier than the third century, was responsible for the large, distinctive insertions which characterize many of the longer Western readings in Acts; but the text had already undergone expansions and changes in a 'free' period of

2.1163. Some later MSS ease the problem by adding εις, but this is almost certainly a secondary attempt to resolve the problem. There is clearly not enough space in 𝔓^{29} for the whole phrase as it appears in the other Greek MSS.

24 See Clark, *Acts*, 382.

25 See Aland, 'Entstehung', 42; Porter, 'Developments', 41. Cf. n. 16 above.

26 See S. New, 'Note XXIII: The Michigan Papyrus Fragment 1571', in F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, eds., *The Beginnings of Christianity Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles,* v. *Additional Notes to the Commentary* (London: Macmillan, 1933), 262–8; earlier, H. A. Sanders, 'A Papyrus Fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection', *HTR* 20 (1927): 1–19; see too Clark, *Acts*, 220–5.

transmission earlier. The precise details of Aland's theory remain matters for debate;[27] but in general terms, there seems no reason to question her more general claim that the Western text shows at times some considerable variation among its main witnesses.

$\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ is evidently not a manuscript written with enormous care. There are one or two clear mistakes:

18: 28 D *εις την αχαιαν*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ *εις την αχαια*

19: 1 D *θελοντος*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ *θελονιος*

19: 12 *πνευματα*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ $\overline{\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha}$ (presumably for $\overline{\pi\nu\tau\alpha}$)

There are some other singular readings, though whether these are the result of scribal copying errors is not so clear:

19: 1–2 *και ευρειν τινας μαθητας. Ειπεν τε προς αυτους*] D *και ευρων τινας μαθητας ειπεν προς αυτους* $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ *και ειπεν τοις μαθηταις*.[28]

19: 2 *οι δε*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ add *απεκριναντο*.

19: 3 *ειπεν δε*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ *ο δε παυλος προς αυτους*

19: 12 *αυτου*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ om

19: 13 *ορκιζω*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ *εξορκιζομεν*[29]

In a number of other instances, $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ shows clear agreement with the D text.

18: 27 *πολυ συνεβαλετο τοις πεπιστευκοσιν δια της χαριτος*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ D *εις την αχαιαν πολυ συνεβαλετο ταις εκκλησιαις*[30]

18: 28 *δημοσια*] D add *διαλεγομενος και* $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ add *διαλεγομενος*[31]

19: 1 *εγενετο δε εν τω τον Απολλω ειναι εν Κορινθω Παυλον διελθοντα το ανωτερικα μερη κατελθειν εις Εφεσον*] $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ D syr^{hmg} *θελοντος δε του Παυλου κατα την ιδιαν βουλην πορευεσθαι εις Ιεροσολυμα ειπεν αυτω το πνευμα υποστρεφειν εις την Ασιαν διελθων δε τα ανωτερικα μερη ερχεται εις*

[27] See e.g. C. M. Tuckett, 'How Early is "the" "Western" Text of Acts?', in T. Nicklas and M. Tilly, eds., *The Book of Acts as Church History* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), 69–86, on the question of whether Irenaeus should be seen as predating the Western Hauptredaktor or not.

[28] The *ειπεν τοι* has to be conjectured, but there is clearly no space for the longer text in either the Alexandrian or Western texts here.

[29] There is variation among other MSS about whether to include the prefix *εξ*-, but only $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ has the plural form of the verb.

[30] The D text here is part of a longer expanded version (relative to the Alexandrian text). The text of $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ is highly fragmentary, and only starts towards the end of this longer D text, but seems to agree closely with it.

[31] The extra *και* in D is arguably necessary and hence the shorter reading in $\mathfrak{P}^{38}$ may be another scribal error. However, it is possible that the papyrus does read *και*: see New, 'Michigan Papyrus', 263.

Εφεσον.[32] This is widely regarded as one of the most characteristic of the longer Western readings in Acts.[33]

19: 2 *εστιν*] 𝔓[38] D *λαμβανουσιν τινες*. The variant here is widely regarded as a secondary attempt to change a difficult text.[34]

19: 3 *ειπεν*] 𝔓[38] D *ελεγεν*

19: 5 *χριστου*] 𝔓[38] D add *εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων*. This looks like a typical Western pious expansion of the text.[35]

19: 14 *ησαν δε τινος Σκευα Ιουδαιου αρχιερεως επτα υιοι*] 𝔓[38] *εν οις και υιοι Σκευια ζ Ιουδαιου τινος αρχιερεως* D (syr^{hmg}) *εν οις και υιοι Σκευα τινος ιερεως*

19: 14 *τουτο ποιουντες*] 𝔓[38] D syr^{hmg} *ηθελησαν το αυτο ποιησαι εθος εχοντες* (D *ειχαν*) *εξορκιζειν τους τοιουτους και εισελθοντες προς τον δαιμονιζομενον ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες Παραγγελλομεν σοι εν ονοματι Ιησου ον Παυλος ο αποστολος* (D om) *κηρυσσει εξελθειν* (D *εξελθειν κηρυσσει*)

19: 15 *αποκριθεν δε*] P[38] *απεκριθεν δε*[36] D *τοτε απεκριθη*

In these last three variants, 𝔓[38] is clearly closely related to D (and syr^{hmg}) with very close verbal agreement between the two, though not absolute identity.[37]

[32] The papyrus is full of lacunae, and in part the text given represents a reconstruction, at times presuming (rather than demonstrating) agreement with the D text. Nevertheless, extant letters and space available do indicate striking agreement with D.

[33] For discussion see e.g. W. A. Strange, 'The Text of Acts 19.1', *NTS* 38 (1992): 145–8, with full references to earlier literature; also Aland, 'Entstehung', 18–22. The variant is widely assumed to be connected to the variant reading in 18: 21 (in D and other witnesses, e.g. 614) where Paul says he intends to go to Jerusalem to celebrate 'the feast'. The long reading in 19: 1 could then be an insertion to explain why Paul never went to Jerusalem: he was overruled by the Holy Spirit. Aland argues that the variant here, which looks typical of the Western text (in substance, and supported by D and syr^{hmg}) must presuppose the earlier variant which must then predate this variant. Hence the variants attest to a developing textual history. It is certainly likely that Western variants entered the tradition at various times: see n. 10 above. However, some later MSS lacking some of the more typical Western readings (e.g. 614, much appealed to by Aland) may represent not so much a pre-D form of the text as a form later influenced by the Byzantine text: see my 'How Early?', 75.

[34] The shorter text, saying that the disciples of John have heard that 'there is (a/the) Holy Spirit', has always caused difficulty: could any Baptist disciples really not be aware of the existence of (the) Holy Spirit? The D reading clearly eases the sense considerably, saying simply that they have not heard that *some have received* the Spirit, but is usually regarded as secondary precisely for that reason. Why would anyone change the latter if it were original?

[35] The reading also appears in a number of later MSS, including 383, 614, 2147, 2412. On the basis of the wider attestation Aland, 'Entstehung', 26–7, argues that it is an expansion prior to the 'Hauptredaktion' of the Western text. But this seems somewhat arbitrary.

[36] Perhaps another scribal error.

[37] For a fuller discussion, see C. M. Tuckett, 'The Sons of Sceva (Acts 19,13–16) and the Narrative of Luke-Acts: A Text-Critical Study', in E. Steffek and Y. Bourquin, eds., *Raconter, interpreter, annoncer* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2003), 305–13. The lack of precise verbal agreement leads Aland to categorize these (along with the readings at 19: 1) as *different* readings in his *Textwert* volume: see K. Aland, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen*

The Alexandrian text creates well-known historical and other problems (e.g. in calling Sceva a 'high priest' and a 'Jew', when there is no known Jewish high priest of that name); and it is widely held that the D reading arises in part to seek to resolve some of these problems, for example, by making Sceva simply a priest, not a high priest, and not saying he is a Jew.[38] However, the Western text form was evidently in a state of flux: at the stage of 𝔓[38], Sceva is still called a 'high priest' and a 'Jew', before these details are changed in the (probably later) D form of the text.

Only very occasionally does 𝔓[38] align with the Alexandrian text against the D text:

19: 4 *τον Ιησουν*] 𝔓[38] txt; D *τον Χριστον* maj *τον Χριστον Ιησου*

Compare too the agreements between 𝔓[38] and the Alexandrian text in the Sceva story ('high priest', 'Jew').

In summary it is clear that the form of the text in P[38] is closely related to the form found in D.[39] On the other hand, it is equally clear that the text form of 𝔓[38] is not identical with that of D. Even in the short compass of text extant here, there are a number of differences; and for example in 19: 14 these differences are not insignificant. All this is in part simply a reflection of the widely held theory that 'the' Western text (especially in Acts) was not a single form of the text, but represents a changing trajectory which developed over the course of time. The text of 𝔓[38] may thus give us insight into an earlier (than D) form of the textual tradition of the Western text.[40] But, as we have seen, 𝔓[38] does not give us a 'pure' text in any sense: it too has some clear mistakes as well as some singular readings.

𝔓[45]

Editio pr.	Date	Provenance	Size	Acts	Quality
Kenyon[41]	III	Unknown	10 × 8 in.	4:27–17:17	Free text, categ. I

Testaments, iii. *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 1.710, 719. On this see my 'How Early?', 72–3.

[38] See my 'Sons of Sceva', 309; for arguments to the contrary, see recently W. A. Strange, 'The Sons of Sceva and the Text of Acts 19.14', *JTS* 38 (1987): 97–106.

[39] New, 'Michigan Papyrus', 265: 'That the general character of this text is Western is obvious at a glance. It has all the paraphrases common to D and the margin of the Harclean Syriac, as well as the interpolation in xix.14.' Also Aland, 'Entstehung', 31, and others.

[40] At the level of actual dates of the MSS themselves, this is of course manifestly obvious. But no one claims that the D text of Acts was *created* in the 5th cent. when the MS was copied: 'the' Western text represents a complex tradition history.

[41] F. C. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri,* ii (London: Emery Walker, 1933).

Extant *nomina sacra*:[42] $\overline{\text{θς}}$ $\overline{\text{θν}}$ $\overline{\text{θυ}}$ $\overline{\text{κς}}$ $\overline{\text{κε}}$ $\overline{\text{κυ}}$ $\overline{\text{χρ}}$ $\overline{\text{ιη}}$ $\overline{\text{πνα}}$ $\overline{\text{πνς}}$ $\overline{\text{πνι}}$ $\overline{\text{πς}}$ $\overline{\text{χρανους}}$

$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ is far more extensive than the other papyri considered here; it has also been the object of very extensive analysis and discussion, especially by Colwell and Royse.[43] No attempt will be made here to give a full discussion of the papyrus, nor to give all examples of any particular phenomenon.

Colwell and Royse are agreed that the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ appears to have been a careful workman. There are admittedly some clear mistakes, for example, in Acts:

13: 46 *κρινετε*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ *κρειντε*

14: 19 *λιθασαντες*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ *λισαντες*

16: 35 *ραβδουχους*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ *αβδουχους*

However, the number of such 'nonsense' readings is relatively low: Royse calculates that the number of singular readings that are nonsensical is only *c.*4 per cent, confirming Colwell's judgement that the scribe wrote with some care.[44]

Elsewhere there are quite a number of singular readings, but Colwell notes that the vast majority result in a reading of the text that is sensible. Occasionally words are added:

9: 39 *εποιει*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ *εποιησεν*[45] *αυταις*

11: 11 *επεστησεν*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ add *μοι*

13: 25 *ουκ ειμι*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ add *εγω*

More often, the scribe has a slightly shorter text, apparently omitting a word or two from his exemplar (insofar as we can tell):

5: 13 *και εμεγαλυνεν αυτους ο λαος*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ om

11: 8 *μου*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ om

15: 38 *τουτον*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ om

14: 16 *γενεαις*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ om

16: 1 *ονοματι*] $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ om

Royse estimates that '$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ omits twice as often as he adds'.[46] Nevertheless, as Colwell argued strongly, the scribe rarely produces nonsense. 'His shortened

[42] Those listed here appear in Acts; others appear in $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$'s text of the gospels.

[43] Colwell, 'Method'; Royse, *Scribal Habits*; also B. Aland, 'The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History', in C. Horton, ed., *The Earliest Gospels* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 108–21.

[44] Colwell, 'Method', 111–12; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 123.

[45] An example of a 'sensible' singular reading.

[46] Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 139; cf. too Colwell, 'Method', 119: 'the most striking aspect of his style is its conciseness . . . In short, he favours brevity.'

text is readable.'[47] This leads Colwell to argue that the scribe was copying with some freedom, but copying by the *sense* of the text, not letter by letter or word by word. Thus the scribe is operating with a presumed sense of some freedom to be able to reproduce the *sense* of the text without having to follow slavishly the precise wording. The same situation may be reflected in, say, the writings of Clement of Alexandria who takes seriously the contents of a text such as the story of the rich young man, and yet when he cites it (in his *Quis Dives Salvetur*) does so in a way that seems remarkably 'free' (or at least showing a striking mixture of apparent variations from the text of Mark as we have in MSS and also influence from the parallel texts in Matthew and Luke).[48]

In relation to textual affinities, 𝔓[45] has been much discussed in relation to its text of Mark, and its possible witness to a 'Caesarean' family.[49] Space permits only a cursory discussion of the text of Acts here. However, in relation to Acts, it is notable that the text of 𝔓[45], although it covers an extensive part of the book (albeit with large lacunae in places), gives no support for any of the readings felt to be distinctive of the Western text.[50] There may be some instances where 𝔓[45] agrees with minor variants sometimes associated with the Western text, but not in instances comparable to for example 19: 1 (as in 𝔓[38] above), or in the text of the Apostolic Decree in 15: 20.[51]

𝔓[45] appears to offer a text which is very similar in general terms to the Alexandrian text, but also exhibits some freedom in reproducing the sense of the text, apparently with rather less concern to reproduce the precise wording down to the tiniest detail. And in this, the papyrus may reflect its own time and situation when the biblical text was revered for its contents, but with rather less concern for the minutiae of textual detail than was the case subsequently in Christian history.[52]

𝔓[48] (*PSI* X 1165)

Editio pr.	Date	Provenance	Size	Acts	Quality
Vitelli & Mercati[53]	III	Oxyrhynchus	13.4 × 11cm	23:12–17, 25–9	Free text, related to D, categ. IV

[47] Colwell, 'Method', 119.

[48] See Aland, 'Significance', 119–20.

[49] See the chapter in this volume on Mark. The issue will not be discussed here.

[50] See Kenyon, *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, p. xviii.

[51] Here 𝔓[45] has one of its most famous variants, the singular reading omitting *και της πορνειας*; but it evidently does *not* know the (equally famous) Western variant omitting *και του πνικτου* and adding a version of the Golden Rule.

[52] See Aland, 'Significance'.

[53] G. Vitelli and G. Mercati, '1165. Act. Apost. 23 11–29', in *Papyri greci e latini della Societa Italiana,* x (Florence: Istituto papirologico, 1932), 112–18. See too Clark, *Acts*, 409–13.

Extant *nomina sacra*: $\overline{υς}$

The papyrus has various lacunae and/or uncertain readings. Certainty about its textual character is thus not possible. The papyrus has usually been regarded as supporting a Western form of the text.[54] Codex D is not extant for this section of Acts, and hence one is reliant on other witnesses, sometimes less direct (e.g. Latin versions).[55]

𝔓48 has some clear mistakes:

23: 12 *αποκτεινωσιν*] 𝔓48 *αποκτειναστην*

23: 14 *αναθεματισαμεν*] 𝔓48 *αναθετισαμεν*

23: 27 *υπο των ιουδαιων*] 𝔓48 repeats the words before *συλλημφθεντα* (dittography)[56]

23: 15 *το συνεδριον*] another possible case of dittography (though the reading is uncertain).[57]

At the beginning of the fragment, there may also be another mistake or corruption: 23: 12 *καιτ* (5/6) *βοηθειαν*. This corresponds with no other witness to the text here and has provoked universal perplexity.[58] It may be another scribal error, or perhaps an attempt to cover over a previous corruption.[59]

Other readings here may be more significant.

23: 12 *ποιησαντες συστροφην*] 𝔓48 *συστραφεντες*[60]

23: 12 *οι Ιουδαιοι*] 𝔓48 *τινες των Ιουδαιων*[61]

23: 13 *οι ταυτην την συνωμοσιαν ποιησαμενοι*] 𝔓48 *οι αναθεματισαντες εαυτους*, compare h (*se devoverant*) hence possibly (but not certainly) a Western reading.[62]

[54] So Clark, *Acts*, 409–13; Aland, 'Entstehung', 36–40, and others.

[55] At a number of points, Porter, 'Developments', finds differences between P48 and 'the' Western text of Clark; on the general issue of over-reliance on Clark's text, see above.

[56] The scribe deletes the extra occurrence by supralinear dots.

[57] Vitelli and Merceti printed the word as *συνε[δρ]ιον*, dotting (only) the *ι*. Various others had suggested emending this to *συναγαγοντες* (see e.g. Clark, *Acts*, 411); however Aland, 'Entstehung', 34, actually prints the reading of the papyrus itself here as *συνα[γα]γοντ[ες]* (dotting only the *τ*). There is a plate of the papyrus in Aland and Aland, *Text*, 62, where the letter after *συν* looks much more like an *α* than an *ε*.

[58] Aland, 'Entstehung', 34: 'schwer zu enträtseln'; Clark, *Acts*, 412.

[59] So Merceti, 116. See too Clark, *Acts*, 412.

[60] Aland, 'Entstehung', 37, argues the reading here may be a genuinely Western one, as the use of the passive of *συστρεφω* seems to be a favourite used by D, cf. Acts 10: 39; 11: 28; 16: 39. But, as noted above, D itself is not extant here.

[61] Aland, 'Entstehung', 37, claims that this is a 'Mehrheitstextlesart', referring to 383, 1838, 2147, and 2652. The reading here is supported by h, possibly (but not certainly) suggesting that it originated in a Western version of the text.

[62] However, the reading may be simply the result of a relatively 'wooden' assimilation of the text to the wording in vv. 12, 14 (so Aland, 'Entstehung', 37).

23: 14 *γευσασθαι*] $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ add *το συνολον* (cf. gig h Lucifer)[63]

23: 15 *υμεις*] $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ gig h Luc syr^{hmg} add *παρακαλουμεν ποιησατε ημιν τουτο συναγαγοντες το συνεδριον εμφανισατε τω χιλιαρχω*[64]

23: 15 *οπως*] $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ 614 h syr^{hmg} add *εαν δεη και αποθανειν*[65]

23: 25 *ηγεμονα*] $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ add *εφοβηθη γαρ μηποτε εξαρπασοντες αυτον οι Ιουδαιοι αποκτεινωσιν και αυτος μεταξυ εγκλημα εχη ως ειληφως αργυρια*. Agreeing closely (but *not* identically) with e.g. 614, 2147, 2412, 2652, gig h syr^{h*}.[66]

23: 27 *μαθων οτι Ρωμαιος εστιν*] $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ gig *κραζοντα και λεγοντα ειναι Ρωμαιον*[67]

Enough has been said to indicate that $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ has a form of the text that is strongly 'Western' in its readings.[68] Even within the small compass of text contained here, there seems to be good evidence that $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ is strongly aligned with other MSS usually thought to be representative of the Western text.

However, we may also note that the evidence here suggests that, where Western readings do occur, there is some considerable variation in wording among the witnesses. (Cf. above on v. 25.) Further, $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ itself seems to be a MS that is written somewhat carelessly (cf. above on mistakes and/or singular readings). Overall, $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ seems to represent a somewhat carelessly written manuscript from within a textual tradition which in itself was not as carefully

[63] Porter, 'Developments', 58, states that this is not in agreement with Clark's Western text which has *το καθολον*. However, this reading is a conjecture of Blass on the basis of the Latin witnesses before the Greek text of $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ was available (see Clark, *Acts*, 411); the text of the papyrus also only became available to Clark after most of the text of his book was in print and this could not then be changed. Any disagreement with Clark's Western text here is thus meaningless.

[64] See Aland, 'Entstehung', 37–8; Clark, *Acts*, 411; Ropes, *Text*, 219, for the evidence. For the uncertainties about the text, see above. Even if one reads *το συνεδριον το συνεδριον*, a plausible correction of the dittography is to postulate a text just as above (see e.g. Clark, *Acts,* 411, following Mercati). This looks very much like one of the more typical Western expansions of the text, clarifying but adding very little new (cf. Aland). $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ thus gives strong support here to a Western variant.

[65] The papyrus is badly damaged, but considerations of space, and a few extant letters, support the reconstruction. The other witnesses supporting the reading (more details in Aland, 'Entstehung', 38; see too Ropes, *Text*, 219; Clark, *Acts*, 411) suggest another 'Western' reading here. Aland seeks to identify this as a reading *pre*dating the 'main' Western redaction. However, it seems hard to make such a distinction on the basis of the evidence available to us: see above, and my 'How Early?', 75, for the general issue.

[66] More detailed evidence about the textual witnesses, and slightly different variants within the variant, in Aland, 'Entstehung', 38. E.g., comparing $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ and 614, $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ has *εξαρπασαντες* (614 *αρπασαντες*), *εγκλημα* (614 *εγκλησιν*), *εχη* (614 *σχη*), with several other small variations in the Greek MSS. The level of verbal disagreement between the witnesses suggests that the reading was not preserved in the textual tradition very precisely.

[67] The reading of $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$ here is in significant part due to the gig reading, so any claims to precise 'agreement' here is the result of a slightly circular argument. However, the space available certainly implies a longer reading than that in the Alexandrian text.

[68] For other possible differences and/or variants, see Clark, Aland, and Porter, though the other readings do not seem to me to be so significant.

preserved as other strands of the NT textual tradition (even in the textual tradition of Acts).

𝔓[53]

Editio pr.	Date	Provenance	Size	Acts	Quality
Sanders[69]	III	Unknown	11.5 × 10cm	9:34–8, 9:40–10:1	At least normal text, categ. I

Extant *nomina sacra*: $\overline{\iota\eta\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\nu}$

𝔓[53] has not aroused much interest in text-critical studies of Acts since its first publication. The reasons are not hard to find. This section of Acts is one where D is not extant, and where there are virtually no distinctive 'Western' readings attested in other witnesses normally associated with D (though see 9: 40 below). This section of text is thus relatively 'quiet' in text-critical terms: it contains no distinctive or significant variants and hence it is correspondingly more difficult to determine any possible textual affiliation for this papyrus.

Insofar as it is possible to say anything at this level, it seems that 𝔓[53] shows closest affinity with Alexandrian MSS (though given that there are few significant variants, one cannot make a strong claim one way or the other).

9: 36 *ονοματι*] 𝔓[53] om[70]

9: 37 *υπερωω*] 𝔓[53] A C E *τω υπερωω*

9: 38 *προς αυτον*] 𝔓[53] *αυτω*[71]

9: 40 *αναστηθι*] 𝔓[53] txt; Cyp it syr$^{\text{hmg}}$ *εν τω ονοματι του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου*[72]

Overall, it is hard to find much evidence either way for determining the textual affinity of the papyrus. The singular readings in 9: 36, 38 are probably not enough on their own to say much about the care (or otherwise) with which the manuscript is written. The text form is close to that of the Alexandrian text with no clear evidence of affinities with the Western text.

[69] In H. A. Sanders, 'A Third Century Papyrus of Matthew and Acts', in R.P. Casey, S. Lake and A.K. Lake, eds., *Quantulacumque* (London: Christophers, 1937), 151–61.

[70] A singular reading and almost certainly a mistake.

[71] Another apparently singular reading, but scarcely significant enough to bear any weight.

[72] This is perhaps the one typically 'Western' reading in this section of text in terms of content and attestation; but 𝔓[53] does not share it.

𝔓^{91}

Editio pr.	Date	Provenance	Size	Acts	Quality
Pickering[73]	III	Unknown	9.6 × 6.5cm	2:30–7, 2:46–3:2	(unspecified)

Extant *nomina sacra*: $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ $\overline{\theta\nu}$ $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ $\overline{\iota\eta\nu}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ $\overline{\chi\rho\nu}$ $\overline{\pi\rho\varsigma}$

The papyrus now numbered 𝔓^{91} is represented by two fragments, one in Milan and one in Sydney, with less than half of each line extant. There are one or two singular readings, probably due to mistakes:

2: 31 *αναστασεως του χριστου*] 𝔓^{91} om *του χριστου*

2: 36 *και*^{1}] 𝔓^{91} om

2: 36 *κυριον . . . χριστον*] 𝔓^{91} *χριστον . . . κυριον*[74]

2: 46 *αφελοτητι*] 𝔓^{91} *αφελοτλοτητι*

In many other respects, 𝔓^{91} appears to be closely related to Alexandrian MSS, and there is little if any support for any similarity between the papyrus and Western readings. To note some of the readings concerned:

2: 34 *λεγει δε . . . ειπεν*] 𝔓^{91} txt; D *ειρηκεν γαρ . . . λεγει*

2: 37 *ακουσαντες δε*] 𝔓^{91} txt; D *τοτε παντες οι συνελθοντες και ακουσαντες*[75]

2: 46 *καθ ημεραν τε προσκαρτερουντες ομοθυμαδον εν τω ιερω κλωντες τε κατ οικον*] 𝔓^{91} txt; D *παντες το προσκαρτερουν εν τν τω ιερω και κατοικουσαν επι το αυτο κλωντες τε*[76]

2: 47–3: 1 *επι το αυτο. Πετρος δε*] P^{91} txt; D *επι το αυτο εν τη εκκλησια. Εν δε ταις ημεραις ταυταις Πετρος Ε* 𝔐 *τη εκκλησια. Επι το αυτο δε Πετρος*[77]

3: 1 *το ιερον*] 𝔓^{91} txt; D add *το δειλεινον*

3: 2 *υπαρχων*] 𝔓^{91} txt; D om

[73] S. P. Pickering, 'P.Macquarie Inv. 360 (+ P.Mil.Volg. Inv. 1224): Acta Apostolorum 2.30–37, 2.46–3.2', *ZPE* 65 (1986): 76–8. For the Milan fragment, see C. Gallazi, 'P.Mil.Vogl.Inv. 1224: Novum Testamentum, Act. 2,30–37 e 2,46–3,2', *BASP* 19 (1982): 39–45; Pickering gives a transcription of the whole fragment insofar as it can be reconstructed.

[74] Only the 'Christ' is extant, but space considerations suggest that 'Lord' followed it. Strictly speaking, 𝔓^{91} is not quite singular here, as the same reading is found in the late minuscule 1831, but this is probably coincidental.

[75] Perhaps a rather more distinctive Western reading than some.

[76] The papyrus is very fragmentary and much of the reading given here is a modern reconstruction, in part no doubt based on the א B (or NA^{26}) text, though what remains of the extant text does support it.

[77] Again the D reading is more distinctive and again 𝔓^{91} does not support it.

$\mathfrak{P}^{91}$ shows close affinities with the Alexandrian text. Where the D text offers a different reading, $\mathfrak{P}^{91}$ sides with the Alexandrian tradition.[78] Within the short compass of the extant text, there are a few errors in copying (cf. above) but not many. Porter's general observation seems fully justified: 'There is some evidence of diversity within the Alexandrian tradition, but no evidence from this manuscript of the so-called Western tradition.'[79] The level of 'diversity' here may suggest a process of relatively careful copying of the text.

MS 0189 (P. BEROL. 11765)

Editio pr.	Date	Provenance	Size	Acts	Quality
Salonius[80]	III[81]	Unknown	18 × 11.5cm	5:3–21	At least normal text; categ. I because of date

Nomina sacra: $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ $\overline{\alpha\nu o\iota\varsigma}$ $\overline{\iota\eta\lambda}$ $\overline{\iota\lambda\eta\mu}$

The extant text comprises two sides of parchment. Space precludes a full listing of every reading in the manuscript. What is striking is how closely the readings align with those of the 'Alexandrian' family, especially codex B.

There are relatively few singular readings probably due to scribal error:

5: 8 *τοσουτου*[1]] 0189 om

5: 10 *επεσεν*] 0189 *επεσον*[82]

5: 19 *νυκτος*] 0189 *νυκγος*

There are a number of readings in this section of Acts with distinctive 'Western'-type readings. However, these readings never appear in 0189. For example:

5: 4 *το πραγμα τουτο*] 0189 txt; D *ποιησαι πονηρον τουτο*

5: 5 *πεσων*] 0189 txt; D *παραχρημα πεσων*

5: 8 *ειπε μοι ει*] 0189 txt; D *επερωτησω σε ει αρα*

[78] See e.g. Pickering, 'P. Macquarie Inv. 360', 76; Strange, *Problem*, 190; Porter, 'Developments', 61.

[79] Porter, 'Developments', 62.

[80] A. H. Salonius, 'Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des Neuen Testaments in den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin', *ZNW* 26 (1927): 97–119, on pp. 116–19.

[81] Opinions on the date vary a little. Salonius (p. 116), dated it to the early 4th cent. Others since have tended to date it slightly earlier. See e.g. Porter, 'Developments', 63. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 103, list it as one of the five parchment MSS of inherent importance because of its age. On p. 103 they say it is 'third/fourth century', though on p. 104 where they print a plate of one page, they say 'second/third century'!

[82] Porter, 'Developments', 64, states that 0189 agrees with B, but B has *επεσεν*. Sense demands a singular here (Sapphira alone falls down).

5: 10 και εξενεγκαντες] 0189 txt; D και συνστειλαντες εξηνεγκαν και[83]

5: 12 παντες] 0189 txt; D add εν τω ιερω

5: 15 ασθενεις] 0189 txt; D add αυτων

5: 15 αυτων] 0189 txt; D add απηλλασοντο γαρ απο πασης ασθενειας ως ειχεν εκαστος αυτων

5: 16 οιτινες εθεραπευοντο απαντες] 0189 txt; D και ιωντο παντες

5: 18 δημοσια] 0189 txt; D add και επορυεθη εις εκαστος εις τα ιδια

5: 21 συνεκαλεσαν] 0189 text; D εγερθεντες τω πρωι και συγκαλεσαμενοι

0189 thus shows no influence of any Western readings at all. It is a MS lying firmly within the Alexandrian textual tradition.

Trying to determine where within the Alexandrian textual tradition the manuscript might lie more precisely is difficult to say. Salonius claims that 'am nächsten steht unsere Hs dem Kodex Vaticanus' (p. 119), referring to three small readings where B appears somewhat isolated within the textual tradition and where 0189 supports the readings of B:

5: 12 δε] 0189 B τε

5: 13 ουδεις] 0189 B ουθεις[84]

5: 19 τε] 0189 B δε

In addition, 0189 agrees with B (along with other MS support) at other places:

5: 12 απαντες] 0189 A B E *pc*

On the other hand, there are some occasions when 0189 goes against the B reading (apart from the singular readings mentioned above):

5: 12 σολομωντος] 0189 txt; B D E P etc. σολομωνος

5: 17 ζηλου] 0189 txt; B ζηλους

These are though relatively trivial differences, and it seems that the text of 0189 is remarkably close to that of B. In some ways, the relationship between the two MSS in this section of Acts is similar to that between 𝔓[75] and B in the parts of Luke and John where 𝔓[75] is extant (though perhaps the length of the extant text in 0189 is not enough to be confident about making such a strong claim). This might then suggest (as others have claimed partly on the basis of the close verbal agreement between B and 𝔓[75] in the Gospels) that the B text is one that has been carefully copied. The evidence of 0189 thus provides an

[83] 0189 has a lacuna here, but there is clearly not enough space for the longer D reading: see Salonius, 'Handschriftenfragmente', 118.

[84] Porter, 'Developments', 64, says that 0189 agrees with both B and ℵ here, but ℵ has ουδις.

important witness to a process of careful copying of the text of Acts in at least one strand of the scribal tradition.

CONCLUSION

Making any kind of generalized conclusions is not easy. The amount of evidence is very small and cannot be taken as necessarily representative. It would appear however, on the basis of the evidence which survives, that the text was handed on relatively freely at times, with little evidence of a process of secondary correction of the text.[85] Moreover, it would seem, on the basis of these fragments, that the Western text was less strictly preserved in relation to the detailed wording than the Alexandrian text. Those papyri which exhibit a text form which could be described as roughly 'Western' ($\mathfrak{P}^{38}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{48}$) also show a number of singular readings which are scribal errors, and some of the readings common to Western witnesses show some disagreement among those witnesses. The papyri (and 0189) exhibiting a text form closer to that of the Alexandrian text appear to contain rather less scribal errors, and show greater agreement with other MSS having an Alexandrian form of text. Perhaps the parade example here is 0189 which has few singular readings and which shows remarkable agreement with B. (Nevertheless, one must remember how slim the body of evidence is!) Further, the general conclusions often drawn about $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, namely, that the scribe has a concern to reproduce the *sense* of the text without necessarily being overanxious to preserve the exact wording at every point, could well apply to all the papyri under consideration here (though the small extent of text preserved in most of them here makes it difficult to be certain). This would probably reflect the general spirit of the age within the Christian churches: as the process of 'canonization' of NT texts was probably a gradual one, so a concern to preserve the exact wording of any text thought to be in some sense 'sacred' may also have been gradual. And the papyri considered here may give us a glimpse of an earlier, rather than a later, stage in that process.

85 Explicit evidence of a corrector at work is only rarely seen, though this may simply reflect the small quantity of text extant in most of the papyri considered here.

10

The Early Text of Paul (and Hebrews)[1]

James R. Royse

Thirteen books of the New Testament are attributed to Paul of Tarsus, although for almost two centuries many scholars have raised doubts as to whether all thirteen go back, in any form, to the historical Paul. A fourteenth book, the Epistle to the Hebrews, seems to owe its place in the canon to the belief that it was written by Paul, although it does not claim to come from him and critical opinion is solidly against Pauline authorship. But whatever the historical origins of these fourteen books may be, from at least the second century they have formed a collection that has been transmitted in Greek and the versional languages. And it is to the textual fate of this collection in the early period that this chapter is devoted.

Table 10.1 presents an overview of the twenty manuscripts (nineteen papyri and one majuscule) that are plausibly dated before 350 CE, that is, from before the time of א and B.[2]

[1] I am grateful to the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center (and its former director, Tyler Mayfield) for access to microfilms of several of the MSS cited here, as well as to the library of the Claremont School of Theology for access to much valuable printed material.

[2] The information in K. Aland *et al.*, *Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments,* 2nd edn. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994) is to be supplemented with the INTTF's online 'Fortführung der Handschriftenliste': http://www.uni-muenster.de/NTTextforschung. There is, of course, controversy about the dating of many MSS, and esp. papyri. There are also sixteen papyri of the Pauline epistles that are past our time limit: $\mathfrak{P}^{11}$ (6th cent.; 1 Cor.), $\mathfrak{P}^{14}$ (6th cent.; 1 Cor.), $\mathfrak{P}^{26}$ (c.600; Rom.), $\mathfrak{P}^{31}$ (7th cent.; Rom.), $\mathfrak{P}^{34}$ (7th cent.; 1 Cor., 2 Cor.), $\mathfrak{P}^{51}$ (c.400; Gal.), $\mathfrak{P}^{61}$ (c.700; Rom., 1 Cor., Phil., Col., 1 Thess. Tit. Phlm.), $\mathfrak{P}^{68}$ (7th cent. (?); 1 Cor.), $\mathfrak{P}^{79}$ (7th cent.; Heb.), $\mathfrak{P}^{89}$ (second half 4th cent.; Heb.), $\mathfrak{P}^{94}$ (5th/6th cents., Rom.), $\mathfrak{P}^{99}$ (*c.*400; Rom., 2 Cor., Gal., Eph.), $\mathfrak{P}^{116}$ (6th/7th cents., Heb. 2: 9–11; 3: 3–6: but see Lincoln Blumell, 'P.Vindob. G 42417 (= $\mathfrak{P}^{116}$)', *ZPE* 171 (2009): 65–9, who argues for a 3rd-cent. date), $\mathfrak{P}^{117}$ (4th/5th cents., 2 Cor. 7: 6–8, 9–11), $\mathfrak{P}^{124}$ (6th cent., 2 Cor. 11: 1–4, 6–9), $\mathfrak{P}^{126}$ (c.350; Heb. 13: 12–13, 19–20). For further information and transcriptions of all the papyri (at the time of publication) of the Pauline epistles, see K. Junack *et al.*, *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,* ii. *Die Paulinischen Briefe,* 1. *Röm., 1. Kor., 2. Kor*. (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), hereafter cited as '*NTP* ii/1'; and K. Wachtel and K. Witte, *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,* ii. *Die Paulinischen Briefe,* 2. *Gal, Eph, Phil, Kol, 1*

Table 10.1. Early Witnesses to Paul and Hebrews (2nd to mid-4th centuries)

G/A	Designation[a]	Date	Provenance	Size[b]	Contents	Textual Quality[c]
$\mathfrak{P}^{10}$	P.Oxy. 2.209	early IV	Oxyrhynchus	25.1 × 19.9	Rom. 1:1–7	free*
$\mathfrak{P}^{12}$	P.Amh. 1.3[d]	III	Arsinoite	20.9 × 23.5	Heb. 1:1	normal?
$\mathfrak{P}^{13}$	P.Oxy. 4.657 + PSI 12.1292	III	Oxyrhynchus		Heb. 2:14–5:5, 10:8–22, 10:29–11:13, 11:28–12:17	free?
$\mathfrak{P}^{15}$	P.Oxy. 7.1008	III	Oxyrhynchus	26.5 × 14	1 Cor. 7:18–8:4	at least normal (free*)
$\mathfrak{P}^{16}$	P.Oxy. 7.1009	III/IV	Oxyrhynchus	15.1 × 11.1	Phil. 3:10–17, 4:2–8	normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{17}$	P.Oxy. 8.1078	IV	Oxyrhynchus	14.2 × 8.4	Heb. 9:12–19	normal*
$\mathfrak{P}^{27}$	P.Oxy. 11.1355	III	Oxyrhynchus	11.2 × 4.4	Rom. 8:12–22, 8:24–27, 8:33–9:3, 9:5–9	strict
$\mathfrak{P}^{30}$	P.Oxy. 13.1598	III	Oxyrhynchus	8.8 × 6.2	1 Thess. 4:12–13, 16–17, 5:3, 8–10, 12–18, 25–28; 2 Thess. 1:1–2	at least normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{32}$	P. Ryl. 5[e]	*c*.200	unknown	10.6 × 4.9	Titus 1:11–15, 2:3–8	at least normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{40}$	P.Bad. 4.57[f]	III	Qarâra		Rom. 1:24–27, 1:31–2:3, 3:21–4:8, 6:4–5, 6:16, 9:16–17, 9:27	free
$\mathfrak{P}^{46}$	P.Beatty 2, Univ. of Michigan, inv. 6238[g]	*c*.200	Aphroditopolis		Rom. 5:17–16:27; Heb.; 1 Cor.; 2 Cor.; Eph.; Gal.; Phil.; Col.; 1 Thess. 1:1, 1:9–2:3, 5:5–9, 5:23–28	free
$\mathfrak{P}^{49}$	P.Yale 1.2 + P.Yale 2.86[h]	III	unknown	13.5 × 29, 2.1 × 5.0	Eph. 4:16–29, 4:32–5:13	at least normal
$\mathfrak{P}^{65}$	PSI 14.1373	III	unknown	4.7 × 16	1 Thess. 1:3–2:1, 2:6–13	strict?
$\mathfrak{P}^{87}$	P.Köln 4.170[i]	III	unknown	3.6 × 5	Philem. 13–15, 24–25	normal (free*)
$\mathfrak{P}^{92}$	P.Narmuthis inv. 69.39a + inv. 69.229a[j]	III/IV	Medînet Mâdi	5 × 7.2, 2 × 4 2	Eph. 1:11–13, 1:19–21; Thess. 1:4–5, 1:11–12	normal*

$\mathfrak{P}^{113}$	P.Oxy. 66.4497	III	Oxyrhynchus	2.7 × 2.4	Rom 2:12–13, 2:29	strict*
$\mathfrak{P}^{114}$	P.Oxy. 66.4498	III	Oxyrhynchus	3.8 × 7.1	Heb 1:7–12	unknown*
$\mathfrak{P}^{118}$	P.Köln 10.406[k]	III	unknown		Rom 15:26–27, 32–33; 16:1, 4–7, 11–12	normal*
$\mathfrak{P}^{123}$	P.Oxy. 72.4844	IV	Oxyrhynchus	7.5 × 6.5	1 Cor 14:31–34; 15:3–6	normal*
0220	Schøyen MS 113[l]	III	Fusṭâṭ	8.8 × 11.4	Rom 4:23–5:3, 5:8–13	strict

[a] Often this will indicate the *editio princeps* as well. Complete bibliographical details are omitted for the series P.Oxy. and PSI.

[b] In cm. Measurements in brackets are of reconstructed size. Measurements are omitted if there are more than two fragments.

[c] These evaluations are taken from K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (1989), where available. My own evaluations are marked with an asterisk; in making these I have tried to follow the criteria of Aland and Aland, despite having some misgivings about those criteria (on which see e.g. K. S. Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums* (2005), 38–41.

[d] B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Amherst Papyri,* i (1900), 28–31; *The Amherst Papyri,* ii (1901), pl. XXV.

[e] A. S. Hunt, *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library,* i (1911), 9.

[f] Inv. G. 645, F. Bilabel, *Veröffentlichungen aus den Badischen Papyrussammlungen,* iv (1924), 28–31.

[g] F. G. Kenyon, ed., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, iii. *Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text* (1934); H. A. Sanders, ed., *A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul* (1935); Kenyon, ed., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, iii. *Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text* (1936).

[h] W. H. P. Hatch and C. Bradford Welles, 'A Hitherto Unpublished Fragment of the Epistle to the Ephesians', *HTR* 51 (1958): 33–7 and pl.; J. F. Oates *et al.*, *Yale Papyri in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library* 1 (1967) 9–14; S. A. Stephens, *Yale Papyri in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library* 2 (1985), 1–2; S. Emmel, 'Greek Biblical Papyri in the Beinecke Library', *ZPE* 112 (1996): 289–94.

[i] Institut für Altertumskunde, Inv. Num. 12, C. Römer, *Kölner Papyri,* 4 (1984): 28–31 and pl. 1b.

[j] C. Gallazzi, 'Frammenti di un codice con le Epistole di Paolo', *ZPE* 46 (1982): 117–22.

[k] Seminar für Ägyptologie, Inv. Num. 10311, G. Schenke, *Kölner Papyri,* 10 (2003): 33–7.

[l] W. H. P. Hatch, 'A Recently Discovered Fragment of the Epistle to the Romans', *HTR* 45 (1952): 81–5.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE WITNESSES

A standard classification of the major textual witnesses is provided by Metzger, who divides the Greek manuscript evidence for the Pauline Epistles as follows:[3]

Alexandrian:	𝔓[46] ℵ A B (C) H (015) I Ψ 33 81 104 326 1739
Western:	D (06) F (010) G (012)
Byzantine:	L (020) 049 and most minuscules

Of course, there has been much debate about the use of such categories generally and about their applicability to the early evidence in particular. Nevertheless, I believe that their usefulness in describing textual phenomena will be seen in our investigation.

Apart from 𝔓[46] (to be discussed below) the chief Alexandrian witnesses listed are ℵ (01), A (02), B (03), and C (04), each of which originally contained the entire Greek Bible. But for the Pauline Epistles C is now lacking for many portions, A is missing 2 Cor. 4: 14–12: 6, and B ends at Heb. 9: 14 (and thus lacks 1 Tim.–Phlm).[4] These attest what Westcott and Hort considered to be the Neutral text, and even if few today would give them that title, it seems clear that these fourth- and fifth-century manuscripts preserve a text that goes back to the second century. We may also mention here the very interesting manuscript 1739 (of the Pauline Epistles, Acts, and the Catholic Epistles), which is from the tenth century, but is generally agreed to preserve a much earlier text. In fact, at least for the Corpus Paulinum 1739 is a witness to the text that Origen used in his commentary on those books. Indeed, it often agrees with the earliest members of the Alexandrian group, including 𝔓[46].[5]

u. 2 Thess, 1 u. 2 Tim, Tit, Phlm, Hebr (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), hereafter cited as '*NTP* ii/2'. Transcriptions of all the early New Testament Greek MSS (at the time of publication) may be found in P. W. Comfort and D. P. Barrett, eds., *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts,* rev. edn. (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001).

[3] B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament,* 1st edn. (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), pp. xxix–xxx = *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament,* 2nd edn. (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 15*–16*. With the change of 'Neutral' to 'Alexandrian,' this classification basically reflects that of B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, as found in their *The New Testament in the Original Greek,* ii. *Introduction* [and] *Appendix,* 2nd edn. (London: Macmillan, 1896), *Introduction*, 148–55.

[4] See the convenient listing of contents in Nestle-Aland (27th edn.), 690.

[5] For the relationship between 𝔓[46] and 1739 see Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (London: British Academy: 1953), 42 and 68–84, and my *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 205–6.

Next, there are the representatives of the Western text, the chief of which are three bilingual (Greek-Latin) manuscripts:

> D (06), Codex Claromontanus. D dates from the sixth, or perhaps even fifth, century, and has the Greek on the left-hand page and the Latin on the right-hand page as the codex lies open. The text in both Greek and Latin is arranged in sense-lines.[6]
>
> F (010), Codex Augiensis, of the ninth century. F arranges the Greek and Latin in columns on each page, so that the Greek occupies the inner columns and the Latin the outer columns as the codex lies open. Here again we find the text in both languages written in sense-lines.
>
> G (012), Codex Boernerianus, also of the ninth century. G writes the Latin above the Greek as an interlinear representation, and indeed as far as is possible given the differences in the texts each Latin word is written above its corresponding Greek word. The text is not written in sense-lines, but one can see that G derives from a manuscript that was so written, since there are larger letters in the Greek that correspond (more or less) to the beginning of sense-lines. It seems generally agreed that G (or, more likely, some ancestor of G) derives from a manuscript written in sense-lines by writing the Greek without breaks but writing (often, at least) the initial letters of such lines as larger letters.

While the representatives of the Alexandrian text are clearly related, these primary representatives of the Western text are extremely closely related. Within this group, D is the oldest, and F and G form an even more closely related pair (and they both lack Hebrews). The precise relation between F and G has been a matter of considerable debate, although for more than a century the usual position has been that of Peter Corssen. In a carefully argued work dedicated to D, F, and G, Corssen concludes that F and G derive (perhaps through intermediaries) from a majuscule ancestor, which he calls X, and that both D and X derive (again, perhaps through intermediaries) from another majuscule ancestor, which he calls Z.[7]

Finally, of course, we have the vast majority of manuscripts, which represent the Byzantine text. The chief witnesses here are K (018), L (020), and P (025), all dating from the ninth century.

[6] D (06) is thus very similar in appearance to Codex Bezae, D (05), and both are primary witnesses to the Western text (of the Gospels and Acts, on the one hand, and of the Pauline Epistles, on the other).

[7] *Epistularum Paulinarum codices Graece et Latine scriptos Augiensem Boernerianum Claromontanum examinavit inter se comparavit ad communem originem revocavit*, *Specimen primum* and *Specimen alterum* (Kiel: Heinrich Fiencke, 1887 and 1889). See further H. J. Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964).

THE EARLY GREEK EVIDENCE

There are, it seems, twenty manuscripts of the Pauline Epistles that date from before the mid-fourth century. Of these by far the most important and the most extensive is 𝔓46. The next most extensive is 𝔓13, and we will begin with those two, and then proceed to the remaining witnesses, which are quite fragmentary. Limitations of space preclude any attempt at completeness in reporting the readings of these twenty-two manuscripts; rather, what is presented is intended to be a representative sample of the corrections, singular readings, and notable agreements found in each witness.[8]

1

𝔓46 is one of the most important manuscripts of the New Testament. It is in fact the most extensive of all the papyri, originally containing much (if not indeed all) of the Pauline Corpus. Its date is commonly cited as *c.*200.[9] Portions of eighty-six of the original one hundred and four folios have been preserved, and generally quite well preserved, usually with significant loss only of a few lines at the bottom.[10] The papyrus is now divided into fifty-six folios known as Chester Beatty Papyrus II (found in Dublin), and thirty folios at the University of Michigan, inv. 6238.

𝔓46 originally contained at least nine of the Pauline Epistles in the following unusual order: Rom., Heb., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Eph., Gal., Phil., Col., 1 Thess., followed by (as seems likely) one or more additional epistles.[11] The extant portion of 𝔓46 ends with 1 Thess. 5: 28 on folio 97^{v}. Since the codex was originally a single-quire codex of one hundred and four folios, seven folios (98–104) or fourteen pages would remain. What book or books occurred at the end is very controversial. There seems to be more than enough space for 2 Thess. and Phlm.[12] Kenyon, though, calculated that there was not then enough space for the Pastorals, and thus proposed that a few leaves at the end were left blank. On the other hand, Duff has argued that 'it is far more likely that 𝔓46 originally did contain the Pastorals'.[13] Duff observes that the scribe begins to place more letters on a page toward the end of the codex, thus probably

[8] I have usually restricted the cited evidence to the Greek MSS, and have often ignored some very weakly supported readings.

[9] On the dating see my *Scribal Habits,* 199–201. And on the provenance, ibid. 17–18.

[10] Kenyon, *Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text,* p. viii, and the figures in n. 1 there.

[11] See further *Scribal Habits*, 202–4. The peculiar sequence of Heb. after Rom. in 𝔓46 is also found in nine minuscule MSS and a Syriac canon, as well as perhaps in 𝔓13 (see below).

[12] See Kenyon, *Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text*, pp. x–xi, who calculated that 2 Thess. and Phlm. would occupy about 4 pages and 1½ pages, respectively.

[13] Jeremy Duff, '𝔓46 and the Pastorals: A Misleading Consensus?', *NTS* 44 (1998): 579.

showing his intention of including the Pastorals. But even with this contraction, the space would have been inadequate, and so there are two possibilities: the scribe left the codex incomplete or added a few more folios in order to copy the Pastorals. Duff thinks that the latter is more likely. In any case, the contraction of his writing shows that the scribe intended to include the Pastorals, and thus $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ 'would in fact be evidence of a Pauline Corpus containing all the canonical Pauline letters'.[14]

The textual nature of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ is basically Alexandrian, but it often supports readings found in D F G and even the occasional Byzantine reading (such as Eph. 5: 9).[15] $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ appears to be closest to B among the most important majuscules, but in Hebrews $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ seems to be a little closer to $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ than to B.[16] (See further on $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ below, where some agreements with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ are cited.) $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ also has a close relationship to the text of 1739.[17]

A few examples of the textual affinities of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ may illustrate these remarks.[18]

Rom. 8: 24 *τιϲ τι και* $\aleph^2$ A C Ψ 33 1881 $\mathfrak{M}$: *τιϲ τι* B^2 D F G *pc* : *τιϲ και* ℵ* 1739^{txt} : *τιϲ* $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ B* 1739$^{v.l.}$

Rom. 9: 20 *ω ανθρωπε μενουνγε* ℵ* A B (*μενουν*) 81 630 1506 1739 1881 *pc* Or^{1739mg} : *μενουνγε ω ανθρωπε rell* : *ω ανθρωπε* $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ D* F G 629

Rom. 9: 31 *νομον* (*sec.*) *δικαιοϲυνηϲ rell* : *νομον* $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ* A B D G *pc*

Rom. 13: 1 *παϲα ψυχη εξουϲιαιϲ υπερεχουϲαιϲ υποταϲϲεϲθω rell* : *παϲαιϲ εξουϲιαιϲ υπερεχουϲαιϲ υποταϲϲεϲθε* $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ D* F G

Eph. 1: 1 *εν εφεϲω* $\aleph^2$ A B^2 D F G Ψ 33 1881 $\mathfrak{M}$: *om.* $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ* B* 6 1739

Eph. 5: 9 *φωτοϲ* $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ ℵ A B D* F G P 6 33 81 629 1175^c 1739 1881 2464 *pc* : *πνευματοϲ* $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ D^2 Ψ $\mathfrak{M}$

Heb. 1: 8 *βαϲιλειαϲ ϲου rell* : *βαϲιλειαϲ αυτου* $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ B

Heb. 6: 2 *διδαχηϲ rell* : *διδαχην* $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ B 0150

We can see one aspect of a scholarly concern for the text in the corrections of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$. These number 183, of which possibly 109 are by the scribe, 56 are by the

[14] Ibid. 585–89, quotation from 590.

[15] See further *Scribal Habits*, 204–5, *NTP* ii/1. xlv, *NTP* ii/2. lii–liii. At the latter place Wachtel and Witte point out that the agreements with D F G do not show that $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ has a special affinity to the Western text, but only that the Western text drew upon already existing readings at those places.

[16] See the tables in Kenyon, *Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text*, pp. xv–xvi. Looking at the percentage of agreements cited, we find that $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and B in Hebrews agree 79.4%, while $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ agree 80.7%. On the other hand, in Ephesians $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and B agree 83.6%, the only agreement higher than that between $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$.

[17] See *Scribal Habits*, 205.

[18] See Kenyon, *Supplement: Pauline Epistles, Text*, pp. xix–xxi; *NTP* ii/1. xlv; and *NTP* ii/2. lii–liii.

second hand, 14 are by the third hand, and 4 are by the fourth hand.[19] The corrections are by no means evenly distributed. They are more frequent toward the beginning of the codex, and are especially frequent in Hebrews, where the first hand makes 33 of his 109 corrections, the second hand makes 42 of his 56, and the third hand makes 6 of his 14. Many of the corrections are of minor slips, but at some places we can see the scribe or a later corrector shifting from one exemplar to another. A particularly instructive example is the two-stage correction at 1 Cor. 6: 14:

εξεγειρει 𝔓$^{46*\text{vid}}$ 𝔓^{11} A D* P 0150 69 88 330 1241$^{\text{s}}$ *pc* :

εξεγερει 𝔓$^{46\text{c1 (man 2 vid)}}$ ℵ C D$^{\text{c}}$ Ψ 33 1881 *rell* :

εξηγειρεν 𝔓$^{46\text{c2 (man 2)}}$ B 6 424$^{\text{c}}$ 1739 Or$^{1739\text{mg}}$:

εγερει 337 :

συνεξεγερει 1908

All three readings found in 𝔓^{46} have weighty support. Since coincidental agreement seems unlikely here, we may conclude that all three readings 'were available to the first two hands of 𝔓^{46}, either in the *Vorlage* of 𝔓^{46} (as text, corrections, or alternative) or in one or two further manuscripts used for correction'.[20] Zuntz had already observed: 'We seem to be granted a glimpse into a scriptorium where some authoritative manuscripts were used by the correctors in an endeavour to bring the productions of the scribes up to a definite standard.'[21]

Furthermore, among the singular readings of 𝔓^{46} are several that appear to represent conflations of readings now found in the Alexandrian and Western traditions.[22] One example is at Phil. 1: 11:

δοξαν και επαινον μοι F G g :

δοξαν και επαινον θεου ℵ A B D$^{\text{c}}$ I Ψ 075 0278 33 1739 1881 𝔐 (*χριστου pro θεου* D* 1962) :

δοξαν $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ (= *θεου*) *και επαινον εμοι* 𝔓^{46}

Of course, to judge *exactly* what happened at such places is a matter of speculation. What seems likely to me is that the scribe's *Vorlage* was marked with corrections or alternative readings. At Phil. 1: 11 the text of the *Vorlage* read as in the Western text (preserved in F G), and the substitution of *θεου* for *μοι* (i.e. the Alexandrian text followed by the Byzantine witnesses) was marked in the margin. But the scribe understood this as a sign to make an addition

[19] See *Scribal Habits*, 211–44. More details will be found there concerning some of the complications and disputes that are here passed over.

[20] *Scribal Habits*, 224.

[21] *The Text of the Epistles*, 257.

[22] See *Scribal Habits*, 335–9.

(and changed *μοι* to *εμοι* as well to emphasize the contrast). The conflated reading was thus created. On the other hand, when later corrections were made, either by the scribe or by a later hand, it seems quite possible that one or two further manuscripts were used. Such a scenario would be most plausible for the sequence of readings found at 1 Cor. 6: 14, although even there it seems possible that there was only one exemplar with two alternative readings.

𝔓46 contains 639 singular readings, and only a brief summary of their characteristics can be presented here.[23] These singular readings are classified as:

orthographic variations	124
nonsense readings	63
additions	52
omissions	161
transpositions	36
substitutions	185
proper names	10
conflations	8

The overall tendency to omit is clearly evidenced in these numbers. Indeed, one of the results of an analysis of the singular readings in the six most extensive early papyri of the New Testament (𝔓45, 𝔓46, 𝔓47, 𝔓66, 𝔓72, and 𝔓75) is that each of them has more omissions than additions.[24] And 𝔓46 ranks at or near the top among these six in its tendency to omit.[25] Especially frequent is the omission of conjunctions and particles, articles, and pronouns. But 𝔓46 also has thirty-three singular omissions of more than one word. The longest of these occurs at Heb. 12: 6–7, where twenty-one words (*μαϲτιγοι . . . παιδευει*) are omitted, so that the text reads: *ον γαρ αγαπα κυριοϲ παιδευει πατηρ*.[26]

Another important aspect of 𝔓46's copying is a tendency to harmonize to the context.[27] There are as many as 112 singular readings of 𝔓46 with this cause. Among such readings may be mentioned: *και περι* for *περι prim.* at Heb. 11: 22, where the *και* was added to provide balance with the following *και περι*; *ο πουϲ* for *το ουϲ* in 1 Cor. 12: 16, where *ο πουϲ* derives from v. 15; and *αιωνια* for *αιωνιαν* at Heb. 9: 12, where *αιωνια* is taken as modifying *τα αγια*.

[23] For a complete analysis see *Scribal Habits*, ch. 5 (pp. 199–358).

[24] See *Scribal Habits*, ch. 10 (pp. 705–36).

[25] See the table and discussion at ibid. 719.

[26] This omission was corrected by the second hand.

[27] One might, of course, expect that harmonization to parallels would not occur all that often in the Pauline Epistles, and in fact only eight singular readings of 𝔓46 appear to have such a cause. However, in all six of the extensive early papyri harmonization to the context is more frequent than harmonization to parallels; see *Scribal Habits*, 904.

Finally, we may note the unique position of the doxology of Romans in 𝔓⁴⁶. These verses, usually printed as Rom. 16: 25–7, where they stand in the Alexandrian text (א B C D 81 1739 *al*), occur in the majority of witnesses after 14: 23, occur both *and* at the end of chapter 16 in A P 33 *pc*, and are omitted entirely in F G 629. But 𝔓⁴⁶ places them after 15: 33. This placement must be connected with the entire set of textual and literary problems associated with the last two chapters of Romans. Although 𝔓⁴⁶ contains chapter 16 in its usual sequence, its position of the doxology reflects an edition of Romans without chapter 16.[28]

2

𝔓¹³, which is dated to *c*.300, is an opisthograph (a roll written on both sides, as in Rev. 5: 1) containing a Latin epitome of Livy on the recto (P.Oxy. 4.668 + PSI 12.1291) and Hebrews on the verso.[29] The preserved text is: Heb. 2: 14–5: 5, 10: 8–22, 10: 29–11: 13, and 11: 28–12: 17. One naturally wonders if more of the Pauline Epistles were originally written. The chief clue to the original extent consists of the column numeration, which begins with $\mu\zeta$ (= 47) and ends with $\xi\theta$ (= 69) for the extant columns.[30] The fact that the columns are numbered may be taken as some evidence that the *Vorlage* of 𝔓¹³ was a codex.[31] Moreover, the beginning of Hebrews would likely have occurred at column $\mu\delta$ (= 44), so presumably some earlier work(s) of Paul preceded it. Now, on the basis of a rough correspondence between the column numbers of 𝔓¹³ and the page numbers of 𝔓⁴⁶, Sanders argued that 𝔓¹³, like 𝔓⁴⁶, attested to a sequence that began with Romans and continued with Hebrews.[32] While this hypothesis can hardly be considered certain, it would seem to be the most likely sequence; otherwise, 𝔓¹³ must have contained Hebrews in a unique order.[33] Moreover, as we shall see, there is a close textual affinity between 𝔓¹³

[28] See the further references in *Scribal Habits*, 301–2.

[29] It and 𝔓¹² are two of the four New Testament papyri from scrolls.

[30] Actually, the number for the last column is lost, but the preceding column is numbered 68.

[31] C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: British Academy, 1979), 10, and *NTP* ii/2. xxxv; the fact that the codex was the usual form for New Testament MSS from the earliest period supports this view. But see E. G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 75–6, who notes a few examples (including 𝔓¹³) of rolls with column numeration.

[32] *Codex*, 34 (who finds the view 'beyond all doubt'); note that Heb. 2: 14 occurs in 𝔓¹³ on col. 47 and in 𝔓⁴⁶ on p. 44, while Heb. 12: 17 occurs in 𝔓¹³ on col. 69 and in 𝔓⁴⁶ on p. 70. Thus, Hebrews occupies more or less the same position in 𝔓¹³ and 𝔓⁴⁶. David Trobisch arrives, apparently independently, at the same view: *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 24–5.

[33] However, Wachtel and Witte (*NTP* ii/2. xxxvi) contend that Romans ('[n]ach Trobischs eigenen Berechnungen') is about 2,900 letters too short for the forty-three allotted columns. But

and $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$. It is tempting to suppose that further Pauline Epistles continued in $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ as they do in $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, but that is a matter of speculation.

There are nine corrections, all apparently by the first hand. Four of these are of itacisms,[34] and three others are of minor slips.[35] The other two are: 11: 4, where $\mathfrak{P}^{13*}$ wrote *αυτου* with virtually all witnesses, which was corrected to *αυτω*, which agrees with z^{c} Cl; and 12: 11, where $\mathfrak{P}^{13*}$ wrote *αυτοιϲ* with D* 479 876, which was corrected to *αυτηϲ*, as in all witnesses except 048, which has *αυτου*. On 11: 4, where the correction is a reading unique among Greek manuscripts, see further below. At 12: 11 the scribe corrects a slip occasioned by the preceding and following -*οιϲ*; I suppose that the support for $\mathfrak{P}^{13*}$ is coincidental. As Wachtel and Witte observe, none of the corrections indicates a comparison with another manuscript.[36]

The scribe makes quite a few mistakes that result in singular or sub-singular readings.[37] The increased frequency of errors from 10: 11 on shows that the scribe became more negligent toward the end of the book. I have counted twenty-seven singular readings, of which fourteen are orthographic singulars,[38] and one is a nonsense reading (*παντοντοϲ* at 2: 15). The remaining twelve may be classified as follows:

> Seven substitutions: 3: 10c, 3: 13 (aorist imperative), 3: 19 (an alternative form),[39] 10: 11 ('sin' for 'sins'), 11: 1a,[40] 11: 4c (*πραγματων αποϲταϲιϲ*), 12: 5. At 3: 10c, 11: 1a, and 12: 5, we have what appear to be deliberate rewritings. At 11: 4c we have a singular reading created by a correction.[41]

Trobisch, *Entstehung*, 25, calculates that the number of letters per column is from 782 to 972 (noting that the number of lines varies from 23 to 27, and the numbers of letters per line from 34 to 36). He calculates a middle value of 867.22, and uses that to estimate that the missing forty-six columns would have held 39,892 letters. Heb. 1: 1–2: 14 would have taken 2,569 letters, leaving 37,323 letters for Romans, which though in fact contains only 34,410 letters (hence the 2,900 (37,323−34,410 = 2,913) shortfall according to Wachtel and Witte). But if we place 34,410 letters on forty-three columns, we obtain 800.23 letters per column, which falls within Trobisch's range. Indeed, given the uncertainties involved (and the varying sizes of letters), the results seem to be strikingly close.

[34] 10: 11, 11: 3, 11: 32, 12: 11.

[35] 4: 11, 10: 11, 10: 16.

[36] *NTP* ii/2. xxxvii.

[37] There is also the false word division at 11: 11 ([*αυτηϲ*] | *αρρα*, for *αυτη ϲαρρα*), as noted at *NTP* ii/2. xxxvi.

[38] 3: 3, 3: 9, 3: 10, 3: 17, 4: 4, 10: 12, 10: 13 (Grenfell and Hunt correctly say that the added *ι* 'was a slip due to the preceding *υποποδιον*'), 10: 18, 11: 1, 11: 4, 11: 34, 12: 8, 12: 10 ($\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ has *αγιοτατηϲ* for *αγιοτητοϲ*; at Jude 20 $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ and 1241 write *αγιοτητι* for *αγιωτατη*, which I similarly took to be orthographic: *Scribal Habits*, 575–6), 12: 11. See *Scribal Habits*, appendix C, for comparable readings.

[39] See BDF §101, which notes besides this reading the form's occurrence in B at Matt. 17: 16 and in ℵ B at Mark 7: 24.

[40] UBSGNT^{4} and Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 2nd edn., 610, cite $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ for *πραγματων αναϲταϲιϲ*, for which I can find no support.

[41] See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 1st edn., 671–2 (not in 2nd edn.).

One addition: 3: 10b. Perhaps we see the influence of the four occurrences of *εν* in vv. 8–11.

Four omissions: 4: 4a, 5: 4–5, 10: 13a, 11: 4b. At 5: 4–5 the codex evidently had an omission within a lacuna, and Grenfell and Hunt, followed by Wachtel and Witte, suggest that the omitted words were *καθωcπερ και ααρων*. On the other hand, I propose that a scribal leap (homoeoteleuton) from *καθωc* to *ουτωc* occurred so that the text omitted was: *περ και ααρων ουτωc*. For the other three omissions I see no cause; the omission of *τω θεω* at 11: 4b is surprising.[42] We have here simply omissions of one word or a short phrase.

The text is basically Alexandrian.[43] 𝔓[13] and 𝔓[46] have striking agreements with each other and with B (which breaks off at 9: 14), although there are also numerous places where they find support from D (the only bilingual text that contains Hebrews). A few of the most striking agreements with the century older 𝔓[46] are:[44]

3: 2 *ολω rell* : *om.* 𝔓[13] 𝔓[46vid] B

3: 6 *μεχρι τελουc βεβαιαν rell* (*καυχημα μεχρι τελουc τηc ελπιδοc βεβαιαν* 323) : *om.* 𝔓[13] 𝔓[46] B

4: 3 *την prim. rell* : *om.* 𝔓[13] 𝔓[46] B D*

10: 37 *χρονιει rell* : *χρονιcει* 𝔓[13] 𝔓[46] א* D*

11: 39 *ουτοι rell* : *om.* 𝔓[13] 𝔓[46] 1739 1881

12: 3 *υμων rell* : *om.* 𝔓[13] 𝔓[46] 69 1739 1881 *pc*

12: 4 *ανταγωνιζομενοι rell* : *αγωνιζομενοι* 𝔓[13] 𝔓[46] 0151 69 1505 *pc*

The first two of these seem to show an especially close relationship among 𝔓[13], 𝔓[46], and B, and it is tempting to think that we would have a few more such readings if B did not end at 9: 14.[45]

As noted above, F and G do not contain Hebrews, and so the discernment of the Western text here is more difficult. Yet 𝔓[13] does sometimes agree with D against the Alexandrian witnesses:

[42] Ibid. 671; *Scribal Habits*, 208–9 n. 63.

[43] See the brief (and accurate) characterization of 𝔓[13] by Grenfell and Hunt (p. 37), as well as their textual notes, and *NTP* ii/2. xxxix. However, without F and G, and without B from 9: 14 on, it is often difficult to judge textual relations.

[44] As discussed above under 𝔓[46], Kenyon found that 𝔓[13] and 𝔓[46] have 80.7% agreement. See also *NTP* ii/2. xxxix. I believe that only at Heb. 12: 5 (with *εγλυου* for *εκλυου*) are 𝔓[13] and 𝔓[46] absolutely alone; see *Scribal Habits*, 206 and 249 n. 256, where the agreement is called coincidental.

[45] In discussing 𝔓[13] Wachtel and Witte, *NTP* ii/2. xxxix, say (surprisingly) that the agreement at 3: 2 is coincidental, and generally assert that there are no agreements with B 'die die Annahme engerer Verwandtschaft begründen könnten'.

4: 5 *ει* 𝔓46 א A B C D1 Ψ 1881 𝔐: *η* I 33 326 : *om.* 𝔓13 D* 81 629 1739 *pc*
10: 16 *αυτη rell* : *αυτη δε* 𝔓13 D*·c
11: 4 *καιν rell* : *καειν* 𝔓13 D*
11: 9 *ιcαακ rell* : *ιcακ* 𝔓13 D*
12: 11 *αυτηc* 𝔓13c *rell* : *αυτοιc* 𝔓13* D* 479 876 : *αυτου* 048

However, in most (if not all) of these coincidental agreement is likely.[46]

And then there are a few places where 𝔓13 and 𝔓46 agree with D against the (other) chief Alexandrian witnesses; among these are:

10: 17 *αυτων prim. rell* : *om.* 𝔓13vid 𝔓46 D* 33 104 1739 *pc*
10: 38 *η ψυχη μου rell* : *μου η ψυχη* 𝔓13 𝔓46 D*·2
12: 2 *cταυρον rell* : *τον cταυρον* 𝔓13 𝔓46 D*·c
12: 3a *τον rell* : *om.* 𝔓13 𝔓46 D* Ψ*

Wachtel and Witte note a few places where 𝔓13 has a Byzantine reading against the old text:[47] at 3: 3 for *ουτοc δοξηc* (𝔓46vid א A B C D P Ψ), 𝔓13 reads *δοξηc ουτοc* with 0243 0278 33 1739 1881 𝔐, and at 11: 37 it apparently reads *επριcθηcαν επειραcθηcαν* with A D1 Ψ 1739 1881 𝔐. There is also 10: 38, where instead of *μου εκ πιcτεωc* (𝔓46 א A H* 33 1739 *pc*) or *εκ πιcτεωc μου* (D* *pc*), 𝔓13 has *εκ πιcτεωc* with D2 Hc I Ψ 1881 𝔐.

We thus find in 𝔓13 basically what we saw in 𝔓46: a manuscript containing a generally Alexandrian text, but with a considerable number of readings found in the Western witnesses (D in Hebrews) as well as some readings found in the Byzantine witnesses.

3

𝔓10, dated to the early fourth century,[48] contains Rom. 1: 1–7, but is unusual in that it is not part of an entire copy of that book (let alone of the entire corpus). Rather, these verses are written separately, as 'a schoolboy's exercise'.[49] Despite being written in 'a large rude uncial', it consistently uses *nomina sacra*, which were, we may suppose, copied from the exemplar.

[46] See *NTP* ii/2. xxxix, where Wachtel and Witte assert that agreements with D either rest on the Alexandrian substrate of D or are coincidental. The omission at 4: 5 is by homoeoarcton (see also 4: 3, where 𝔓13vid A *pc* omit *ει*), while the (corrected) reading at 12: 11 was occasioned by the preceding and following *-οιc*. Only at 10: 16 is a genetic relation at all plausible.

[47] *NTP* ii/2. xxxix. They also include 4: 7, saying that 𝔓13 read *ειρηται*; yet in the transcript, following Grenfell and Hunt's note, they print *προειρη*]*ται*.

[48] As Grenfell and Hunt, P.Oxy. 2.8, note, 'the papyrus was found tied up with a contract dated in 316 A.D., and other documents of the same period'.

[49] Ibid. See further the detailed study by A. Luijendijk, 'A New Testament Papyrus and its Documentary Context: An Early Christian Writing Exercise from the Archive of Leonidas (P.Oxy. II 209/𝔓10)', *JBL* 129 (2010): 575–96.

I have counted eleven singular readings, of which nine are orthographic or obvious slips.[50] There remain two more substantial ones. At 1: 5–6 for *ονοματοϲ αυτου ϵν οιϲ ϵϲτϵ και υμϵιϲ κλητοι ιηϲου χριϲτου*, 𝔓^{10} has *ονοματοϲ ιηϲου χριϲτου*. Junack *et al.*, describe this long omission as a ‘Sinnsprung’, resulting in the locution ‘the name of Jesus Christ’.[51] But the omission is, I believe, more likely to be the result of a scribal leap (*ονοματοϲ αυτου ϵν οιϲ ϵϲτϵ και υμϵιϲ κλητοι ιηϲου χριϲτου*), if we assume that the final letter of *κλητοι* appeared to be a sigma, at least in the eyes of this schoolboy. Finally, at 1: 7 for *ιηϲου χριϲτου* 𝔓^{10} reads *χριϲτου ιηϲου*, which agrees with the order at 1: 1.

According to Grenfell and Hunt, the ‘only variant of any importance’ is at 1: 1: for *ιηϲου χριϲτου*, as found in 𝔓^{26} א A G *Ψ* 33 1739 1881 𝔐, *χριϲτου ιηϲου* is read by 𝔓^{10} B 81 *pc*. The agreement with the Alexandrian B and 81 suggests that this reading was part of the schoolboy’s exemplar. Of course, the order of this name frequently varies at the beginning of the Pauline letters.

4

𝔓^{12} is an especially interesting artifact. It consists of one leaf of a roll, on the recto of which is a Christian letter written from Rome by, as it seems, an Egyptian Christian in the latter part of the third century.[52] At the top of the second column a different hand, dated to the late third or early fourth century, has written most of Heb. 1: 1 (*πολυμϵρωϲ . . . προφηταιϲ*). Then, on the verso of the roll a more cursive hand has written Gen. 1: 1–5 as in the LXX followed by the same verses in the version of Aquila. The purpose of the citation from Hebrews is uncertain. It contains the *nomen sacrum* θ̅ϲ̅ and the itacistic writing *παλϵ*. The brevity of the text makes any assessment risky, but it does have one interesting reading. At 1: 2, where *πατραϲιν* is found in 𝔓^{46*} *rell*, *πατραϲιν ημων* is read by 𝔓^{12} 𝔓$^{46c(man\ 2)}$ 181 999 1836 1898 *pc*. This is the only fluctuation among the papyri and majuscules in the opening verse of Hebrews, and the agreement here is intriguing. However, in discussing the reading of the corrector of 𝔓^{46}, I suggested that the ‘addition of *ημων* is perhaps natural enough that coincidental agreement is likely’, and that the corrector may have simply added this word without finding it in an exemplar.[53] I would think that the same could be said of 𝔓^{12}.

[50] 1: 2a, 1: 2b, 1: 3, 1: 4, 1: 5a, 1: 5b, 1: 5c, 1: 7a, 1: 7b.

[51] *NTP* ii/1. xxii.

[52] It and 𝔓^{13} are two of the four New Testament papyri from scrolls.

[53] *Scribal Habits*, 237 and n. 185. On the other hand, Sanders, *Codex*, 33, judges it ‘not likely that the error would have arisen twice independently’.

5

𝔓¹⁵ is one folio containing 1 Cor. 7: 18–32 (verso), and 7: 32–8: 4 (recto). It is dated to the third or perhaps early fourth century. It may form part of one codex with 𝔓¹⁶.[54]

At 7: 35 it has the rewriting *απϵριϲπαϲτουϲ ϵιναι* for *απϵριϲπαϲτωϲ*, perhaps modelled on *αμϵριμνουϲ ϵιναι* of v. 32. It seems to create a nonsense reading at 7: 25 by omitting two letters by a scribal leap.[55] But at several other places it has omissions of words by scribal leaps,[56] while at 7: 40 it agrees with 33 in writing *χριϲτου* for *θϵου* and at 7: 24 it seems to agree with A in adding *τω*.

The text of 𝔓¹⁵ seems to be basically Alexandrian, as we see at 7: 34, where it has *και μϵμϵριϲται και* with 𝔓⁴⁶ א A B P 6 33 81 104 365 1175 1505 1739 1881 2464 *al* Or^{1739mg}. Indeed, sometimes it agrees mainly with a small set of the oldest witnesses; for example, at 7: 31 it has *τον κοϲμον*, with 𝔓⁴⁶ א* A B, instead of *τον κοϲμον τουτον* or *τω κοϲμω τουτω*, at 7: 35 it has *ϲυμφορον*, with 𝔓⁴⁶ א* A B D* 33 *pc*, instead of *ϲυμφϵρον*, and at 7: 38 it has *ποιηϲϵι* (*prim.*), with 𝔓⁴⁶ B 6 1739 1881 *pc*, instead of *ποιϵι*. However, such agreement may be, at least in part, coincidental; note that the omission of *τουτον* at 7: 31 could be by a scribal leap after *κοϲμον*, and that the shift at 7: 38 may be a harmonization to *ποιηϲϵι* at the end of the verse.

On the other hand at several places it agrees with D F G against 𝔓⁴⁶ א A B: 7: 18 (*τιϲ κϵκληται*), 7:29 (*om. το*), and 7: 34 (*om. τω*). We thus seem to have a pattern similar to that of 𝔓⁴⁶: a basically Alexandrian text with an admixture of Western readings, displaying idiosyncrasies, including a tendency to omit.

6

𝔓¹⁶ is the remains of one folio, dated to *c*.300, and containing Phil. 3: 10–17 (recto), 4: 2–8 (verso). This may be part of one codex along with 𝔓¹⁵, in which case we have a manuscript of the Pauline Corpus, but with no evidence as to its further extent or sequence.

Among the singular readings are transpositions at 3: 13 and 3: 14. The verbal shifts at 3: 16 (*ϵφθαϲατϵ* for *ϵφθαϲαμϵν*) and 4: 2 (*φρονϵιτϵ* for *φρονϵιν*) seem to be harmonizations, the first to *φρονϵιτϵ* in v. 15b, the second to the

[54] As is argued in Comfort and Barrett, *Manuscripts*, 93 and 95. See, on the other hand, *NTP* ii/2. xli.

[55] Although Hunt simply prints *παρ[θ]ϵ̣[νω]ν*, both Junack *et al.* (*NTP* ii/1) and Comfort and Barrett (*Manuscripts*) state that the space between the *ρ* and *ν* is too narrow for *θϵνω*. Junack *et al.* thus assume an error and print *παρ̣θ̣[ ]ν̣*, while Comfort and Barrett print *παρ[θω]ν*. I suggest *παρ[θϵ]ν* by an internal leap: *παρθϵν̲ω̇ν̲*.

[56] 7: 35 (*αυτων* after *υμων*), 7: 37a (*ϵν* after *ϵϲτηκϵν* [*vid*]), 7: 37b (*ϵν* after *κϵκρικϵν*).

imperatives in vv. 1–9.[57] At 4: 3 instead of *λοιπων cυνεργων μου*, 𝔓^{16vid} ℵ* have *cυνεργων μου και των λοιπων*. I would suggest that the scribe omitted *λοιπων* by a leap (*των λοιπων*), and then restored it after writing *cυνεργων μου*, adding *και των* to make the connection.[58] If so, then, 𝔓^{16} and ℵ could have made the same error independently. And at 4: 7, where *τα νοηματα* is found in 𝔓^{46} *rell* f vg, and *τα σωματα* is found in F^{gr} G ar d MVict Pel, 𝔓^{16vid} reads *τα νοηματα και τα cωματα*. We thus see a conflation between the usual text and the text of F G and some Latin witnesses (including d and g).[59] I would suggest that the scribe (like the scribe of 𝔓^{46} at Phil. 1: 11) misunderstood a correction in his *Vorlage*: instead of substituting *cωματα* the scribe added it along with *και τα*. We thus see that the peculiar reading of F G goes back to at least the third century.

In general 𝔓^{16} agrees with 𝔓^{46} ℵ A B. However, it does not share singular or weakly supported readings of ℵ at 3: 10 and 3: 15, and it goes with ℵ* B in reading *γνηcιε cυζυγε* at 4: 3, as opposed to *γνηcιε cυνζυγε*, as found in 𝔓^{46} ℵ^{2} A D$^{*.c}$. It goes against D F G at 3:12 (where 𝔓^{46} joins them in adding a clause after *ελαβον*) and at several other places.

7

𝔓^{17} is a fragment of one folio, dated to the fourth century, and contains Heb. 9: 12–14 (recto), 9: 15–19 (verso). At 9: 14 *ποcω* seems to have been marked to read *πολλω*, as found in 33 (agreeing with Rom. 5: 9); otherwise, the text shows no discrepancy from the consensus of the older majuscules (B ends with *καθα[ριει* at 9: 14). It is thus similar to that of 𝔓^{46}, but avoids four errors found in 𝔓^{46}: the omission of *του* in 9: 12, the unique long omission by a scribal leap at 9: 14, the unique transposition at 9: 15, and the omission of *και των τραγων* at 9: 19 found in quite a few other witnesses.[60] At the last place, there are four attested readings: *μοcχων και των τραγων* ℵ* A C 81 326 629 2464 *al* : *τραγων και των μοcχων* D 365 sa^{ms} : *μοcχων και τραγων* P 33 𝔐: *μοcχων* 𝔓^{46} ℵ^{2} K L *Ψ* 0278 1241 1505 1739 1881 *al*. Here 𝔓^{17} preserves only the final *ν̣* of the phrase; but the space involved makes it certain that it did not have the omission found in 𝔓^{46}. Likely it agreed with ℵ* A C, but possibly with D, and conceivably with P.

[57] *NTP* ii/2. xlii.
[58] Wachtel and Witte (*NTP* ii/2. xlii) suggest that the change makes the text more precise.
[59] Wachtel and Witte call it a 'Mischvariante' (ii/2. xlii) and 'Mischlesart' (ad loc.).
[60] See Sanders, *Codex*, 34; *NTP* ii/2. xliv.

8

𝔓²⁷ consists of one folio, dated to the third century, containing Rom. 8: 12–22, 8: 24–7 (recto); 8: 33–9: 3, 9: 5–9 (verso). According to Comfort and Barrett the same scribe may have written it and 𝔓²⁰, although Junack *et al.* assert that 𝔓²⁷ is certainly older than 𝔓²⁰.[61] There is one correction, which was (it seems) made from one singular reading to another singular reading. At 8: 21, for ελευθερωθηcεται απο, it seems that 𝔓²⁷ first wrote ηλευθερωθη εκ, and then corrected to ελευθερουται απο (with surely coincidental support from the first hand of one Vulgate manuscript).

The text is basically Alexandrian, agreeing most often with ℵ A B.[62] In fact, the only places where 𝔓²⁷ does not agree with at least two of ℵ A B are: 8: 20, where 𝔓²⁷ A B² C D² 33 1739 1881 𝔐 Cl^ex Thd have επ ελπιδι, instead of εφ ελπιδι, as in 𝔓⁴⁶ ℵ B* D* F G Ψ; 8: 34, where 𝔓^27vid pr. sp. 𝔓⁴⁶ ℵ² B D F G 1739 1881 𝔐 have εγερθειc, instead of εγερθειc εκ νεκρων, as in ℵ* A C Ψ 0289^vid 33 81 104 1506 *pc*; and again 8: 34, where 𝔓²⁷ has και *prim.* with 𝔓⁴⁶ ℵ² B D F G Ψ 33 𝔐, which is omitted by ℵ* A C 0289^vid. And 𝔓²⁷ thus agrees almost everywhere with the Nestle-Aland text; the only departure is at 8: 20, where Nestle-Aland prints εφ ελπιδι.

It is perhaps worth noting that 𝔓²⁷ certainly did not have B's singular θεου τηc εν χριcτου ιηcου at 8: 35 or B*'s singular omission of αδελφου μου των at 9: 3. It goes against D F G at 8: 13 (του cωματοc 𝔓²⁷ ℵ A B *rell* : τηc caρκοc D F G 630 *pc*) and elsewhere. Grenfell and Hunt suggested that 𝔓²⁷ read ουν at 8:35 with F G and χριcτω ιηcου at 9: 1 with D* F G, but these are in lacunae and are doubtful. And 𝔓²⁷ does not share several errors of 𝔓⁴⁶, for example, at 8: 17 (*om.* κληρονομοι μεν) and at 9: 2 (μοι λυπη).

9

𝔓³⁰ consists of five fragments of three folios, dated to the third century (or perhaps early fourth), that contain 1 Thess. 4: 12–13, 16–17 (1^r), 5: 3, 8–10 (1^v), 5: 12–18 (2^v), 5: 25–8 (2^r); 2 Thess. 1: 1–2, 2: 1 (2^r), 2: 9–11 (2^v). There are two fragments of folio 1, and two fragments of folio 2, which followed immediately folio 1. The small fragment 5 was identified by Comfort, who places the remains at 2 Thess. 2: 1 (frag. 5^r) and 2: 9–11 (frag. 5^v).[63]

61 Comfort and Barrett, *Manuscripts*, 107 and 119; *NTP* ii/1. xxxi.

62 Junack *et al.* cite 𝔓^27vid for τιc with 𝔓⁴⁶ B* at 8: 24 (*NTP* ii/1. xxxii and 63); however, this occurs in a long lacuna, and Nestle-Aland more cautiously does not cite 𝔓²⁷ here.

63 P. W. Comfort, 'New Reconstructions and Identifications of New Testament Papyri', *NovT* 41 (1999): 219–20. See further Comfort and Barrett, *Manuscripts*, 128–33.

One particularly interesting aspect of the remains of this codex is that the first folio preserves the pagination 207–8. We may compare these numbers with those of 𝔓46; there 1 Thess. 5: 5–9 occur on p. 193 (fo. 97r). However, the amount of text on a page of 𝔓30 is a bit more than on a page of 𝔓46.[64] We can thus judge that 1 Thess. would have occurred in more or less the usual position in the corpus, although the precise sequence of the other letters is of course uncertain.

𝔓30 seems to have four singular readings, although none is completely clear. At 1 Thess. 5: 10 there is an addition after ημων, which the editors suggest was παντων, and at 1 Thess. 5: 14 there is an addition after αcθενων, which the editors suggest was εν υμιν. At 1 Thess. 5: 27, where the other witnesses have τοιc αδελφοιc (א* B D F G 0278 *pc*) or τοιc αγιοιc αδελφοιc (א2 A Ψ 33 1739 1881 𝔐), only]αδελφ[is preserved in 𝔓30. There is not enough space for τοιc αγιοιc before αδελφοιc, and after αδελφοιc there is space for eight to ten letters before the following η χαριc. The editors accordingly suggest τοιc] αδελφ[οιc τοιc αγιοιc. It would thus seem that the scribe of 𝔓30 at these three places has created longer readings. Finally, at 1 Thess. 5: 13 for υπερεκπεριccου (א A D2 Ψ 0278 33 1739 1881 𝔐) or υπερεκπεριccωc (B D* F G *pc*), 𝔓30vid pr. sp. has εκ]περιccου.

The text of 𝔓30 is generally Alexandrian. At three places it agrees with B against almost all other witnesses: 1 Thess. 5: 9a (*ο θεοc ημαc* 𝔓30 B *pc*), 1 Thess. 5: 9b (*om. χριcτου* 𝔓30vid pr. sp. B), and 2 Thess. 2:1b (*om. ημων prim.* 𝔓30 B Ψ *pc*). Elsewhere it usually agrees with א or B, if not both. There is very little overlap with 𝔓46; at 1 Thess. 5: 27 the spacing suggests that it reads ενορκιζω (in a lacuna) with 𝔓46 A B D* 0278 6 33 323 945 1739 1881 *al*, instead of ορκιζω with א D2 F G Ψ 𝔐.

In fact, apart from its singular readings, its only disagreements with B seem to be: 1 Thess. 4: 17, where 𝔓30 א A D F G 𝔐 have cυν, while εν is read by B 0142; 1 Thess. 5: 10, where 𝔓30 א2 A D F G Ψ 0278 1739 1881 𝔐 have υπερ, while περι is read by א* B 33; and 1 Thess. 5: 13, where 𝔓30 א D* F G P Ψ 81 104 1505 1881* 2464 *pm* have αυτοιc, while εαυτοιc is read by A B D2 K L 0278 33 365 630 1175 1241 1739 1881c *pm*.

10

𝔓32 consists of one folio, from *c*.200, which contains Tit. 1: 11–15 (recto), 2: 3–8 (verso). It agrees with F G 1881 *pc* at 2: 7 in writing αφθονιαν instead of αφθοριαν or αδιαφθοριαν, pushing the date of this reading back more than six centuries. However, elsewhere it does not have distinctive readings of F G (1: 12

[64] See the calculations at *NTP* ii/2. xlvi and Trobisch, *Entstehung*, 25–6.

om. *αυτων sec.*, 1: 14 *ενταλμαϲιν*). The only other notable reading is at 2: 7, where the space makes it certain that $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ agrees with ℵ A C D* F G P 33 81 365 1739 1881 *pc* in reading *ϲεμνοτητα* without the addition of *αφθαρϲιαν* as in D² Ψ $\mathfrak{M}$. Our scant evidence thus is that, apart from the agreement with F G, the papyrus agrees consistently with ℵ* A C D* P.

11

$\mathfrak{P}^{40}$, from the third century,[65] consists of seven fragments that contain the remnants of four folios containing Rom. 1: 24–7 (fr. a + fr. d = 1^{r}), 1: 31–2: 3 (fr. a + fr. d = 1^{v}), 3: 21–6 (fr. b = 2^{v}), 3: 26–4: 8 (fr. b = 2^{r}), 6: 2–5 (fr. f + fr. c = 3^{r}), 6: 14–16 (fr. f + fr. c = 3^{v}), 9: 16–17 (fr. e = 4^{r}), 9: 27 (fr. e = 4^{v}), as well as one unidentified fragment.[66]

Among its singular readings are three long omissions by leaps (3: 31 [*ακροβυϲτιαν δια τηϲ πιϲτεωϲ νομον ουν καταργουμεν δια τηϲ πιϲτεωϲ*],[67] 4: 1–2 [*αβρααμ ... αβρααμ*], 4: 6 [*δικαιοϲυνην ... δικαιοϲυνην*]), as well as the reading at 4: 5a where an initial leap backward (from *τω δε* in v. 5 to the one in v. 4) was unrepaired, so that the text reads: *τω δε εργαζομενω ου λογιζεται ο μιϲθοϲ κατα χαριν πιϲτευοντι κτλ*. There are also the curious *ν̅ι̅* for *ι̅ν̅* (=*ιηϲου*) at 3:22, and *δοξεωϲ* for *δοξηϲ* at 3:23. From these errors Bilabel judged that the scribe understood little of the text, and noted that at the time of writing (which he assigned to the fifth/sixth century) Greek was hardly understood any more at Qarâra.

In general, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$ agrees with ℵ A B. Indeed, except for its own singular readings and B's singular omission of *ιηϲου* at 3: 22, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$ agrees everywhere with B.[68] It thus disagrees with D* F G 440 in omitting *δε* at 4: 3, and with D F G and the majority in adding *και επι πανταϲ* at 3: 22. A less common alignment occurs at 3: 25, where the space requires that $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$ has *δια τηϲ πιϲτεωϲ* with B C³ D² Ψ 33 $\mathfrak{M}$ rather than *δια πιϲτεωϲ* with ℵ C* D* F G 0219^{vid} 365 1505 1506 1739 1881 *al* (*plane om.* A *pc*). And at 4: 2 $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$ agrees with ℵ A B C D* F G in having *θεον* instead of *τον θεον* with the majority. Finally, there are two variations where $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ can be cited. At 9: 16 $\mathfrak{P}^{40vid}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A B* D F G P 326 *pc* have *ελεωντοϲ* instead of *ελεουντοϲ* (B² K Ψ *rell*) or *ευδοκουντοϲ* (L). And at 9: 17 $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{46c}$ ℵ A B D G K *rell* have *ενδειξωμαι* instead of *ενδειξομαι* ($\mathfrak{P}^{46*}$ F L P Ψ 0151 6 33 104 242 1241 1424 *pc*).

[65] In the *editio princeps* Bilabel dated it to the 5th/6th cents.

[66] In the *editio princeps* Bilabel identified fragments a, b, and c (but edited only a and b), Schofield identified fragments d and e (and edited c, d, and e), and Comfort ('New Reconstructions', 220–1) identified fragment f.

[67] Here we surely have coincidental agreement from 1505, 2495.

[68] Comfort, 'New Reconstructions', cites $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$ for omitting *ιηϲουν* at 6: 2 with B; see Comfort and Barrett, *Manuscripts*, 153. This is possible, but is in a lacuna of most of the line.

12

$\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ is one folio of a third-century codex, containing Eph. 4: 16–29 (recto) and 4: 31–5: 13 (verso).[69] On the possible identity of this codex with that of $\mathfrak{P}^{65}$, see under the latter.

There seem to be six singular readings. At 5: 5 $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ has the orthographic fault κληρονομεια for κληρονομιαν. There are three omissions of short words: 4: 22 (υμαϲ), 4: 32 (και), and 5: 12 (γαρ). At 5: 8 $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ has ωϲπερ for ωϲ. Finally, at 5: 6 there is the interesting reading απιϲτιαϲ for απειθειαϲ; $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ shows a preference in Hebrews for the forms in απιϲτ-, but not elsewhere (and it is lacking at Eph. 5: 6).[70]

The text generally agrees with the Alexandrian witnesses.[71] For example, at 4: 26 it omits τω with ℵ* A B 1739* alone. Again, at 5: 3 it reads ακαθαρϲια παϲα η πλεονεξια with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A B P 0159 33 104 326. Elsewhere the Alexandrian witnesses are divided. At 4: 23 $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ agrees with B 33 1175 1739 1881 *pc* in having εν against $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A *rell*. At 5: 2 it agrees with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A *rell* in having ημων instead of υμων with B 0278^{c} 1175 *pc*. At 4: 32 $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ has δε with ℵ A D^{2} Ψ 33 1739^{mg} 𝔐, whereas $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ B 0278 6 104* 1739* 1881 *pc* omit, and D* F G 1175 have ουν.

At 5: 10 it sides with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A B and almost all witnesses against D* F G 81* *pc* in reading κυριω instead of θεω. But at 5: 5 it joins the Alexandrian and Western witnesses in having ιϲτε in place of εϲτε, which is read by the Byzantine witnesses. Finally, at Eph. 5: 9 it sides with the Alexandrian and Western witnesses in reading φωτοϲ against $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and the Byzantine witnesses, which have πνευματοϲ.

13

$\mathfrak{P}^{65}$ is a thin fragment from one folio of a codex of the latter part of the third century, containing 1 Thess. 1: 3–2: 1 (recto), 2: 6–13 (verso). On the recto only the right-hand portions of the lines (with at most nine letters) are extant,

[69] There is confusion about two *nomina sacra*. Hatch and Welles cite $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ as having $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ (=κυριου) for χριϲτου in 5: 5, but Welles, Wachtel and Witte, Comfort and Barrett, and Emmel agree in writing $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$, which is perfectly clear in the plate (Tafel III). On the other hand, although the *editio princeps* has $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ (=κυριω) at 5: 10, Welles says that at l. 20 'I would now read *ΧΩ* with the manuscripts rather than *ΚΩ*.' Emmel says that this statement 'seems to entail confusion' between l. 13 (= 5: 5) and l. 20 (= 5: 10). Wachtel and Witte edit $\overline{\kappa\omega}$, but their comments seem to support the other reading, and Comfort and Barrett print $\overline{\chi\omega}$. Nevertheless, Emmel says that $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ in 5: 10 'was never in doubt', and indeed in the accompanying plate (Tafel III), the κ is perfectly clear. Cf. the remarks on 1 Thess. 1: 3 in $\mathfrak{P}^{65}$.

[70] See *Scribal Habits*, 310–11, on $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$'s Heb. 3: 18 etc., and esp. n. 628 on $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$'s reading.

[71] See the figures at Hatch and Welles, 34.

while on the verso only the left-hand portions of the lines (with at most six letters) survive.

Bartoletti suggested that 𝔓49 and 𝔓65 were two folios from the same codex, and Comfort and Barrett argue strongly for the identity. Certainly the writing is very similar. However, Wachtel and Witte call attention to various differences.[72] I have accordingly treated these as two separate manuscripts.

There are two singular readings. At 1: 3 evidently by a confusion of *nomina sacra* 𝔓65 wrote $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ for $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$.[73] This is at the end of the line, so we cannot see whether this was a simple substitution or some further confusion was involved. However, from the number of letters in the lines it seems as though the scribe wrote something other than the awkward *του* $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ *ημων* $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$ $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ *ϵμπροϲθϵν κτλ.*, which would make the line too short.[74] Rather, I suggest that the scribe, having written $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$, noticed his error but decided to incorporate that word rather than correct it, and thus wrote: *του* $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$ *του* $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ *ημων ϵμπροϲθϵν κτλ.*[75]

The other singular is at 2:10, where apparently the scribe wrote the aorist *πιϲτϵυϲαϲιν* (*ϲαϲιν* is all that survives) instead of *πιϲτϵυουϲιν*. It is tempting to think that the agreement with lat ('uobis qui credidistis') is coincidental. In any case, it is remarkable that at Eph. 5: 6 𝔓49 alone has *απιϲτιαϲ* for *απϵιθϵιαϲ*. If in fact 𝔓49 and 𝔓65 are the same codex, then we seem to have some preferences regarding 'belief'.

Apart from its singular readings, 𝔓65 agrees everywhere with B, although it is not extant for some peculiar readings of B, such as its singular addition of *και* in 1: 6. We can see that 𝔓65 avoids singular readings of א* (*υμιν* for *ϵιϲ υμαϲ* at 2: 9) and A (*om. τηϲ ϵλπιδοϲ* at 1: 3), and goes against D F G at 1: 3 (*υμων post πιϲτϵωϲ* at 1: 3). At the important variation at 2: 7 𝔓65 goes with both the Alexandrian and Western witnesses (א* B C* D* F G, but not A) in reading *νηπιοι* instead of *ηπιοι*.

14

𝔓87 consists of one folio from the early third century, containing Phlm. 13–15 (recto), 24–25 (verso). Although it is hardly necessary that we have here a

[72] *NTP* ii/2. lxi. These points are not discussed by Comfort and Barrett.

[73] The *editio princeps* and Wachtel and Witte agree in reading $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ at 1: 3. However, Comfort and Barrett read $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ = *χριϲτου*, and from their photograph (p. 357, l. 2) this seems to be correct. One may compare the *κ* in l. 5 and the *χ* in ll. 10 and 13. Cf. the remarks on Eph. 5: 10 in 𝔓49. (The only other reading at 1: 3 is *θϵου* in 0278.)

[74] In Bartoletti's reconstruction ll. 2, 3, and 4 have 46, 38, and 46 letters, respectively.

[75] This is close to Comfort and Barrett's reconstruction, whose lines have 46, 39, and 46 letters, since they write $\overline{\pi\rho\varsigma}$ instead of $\overline{\pi\varsigma}$. Moreover, Comfort and Barrett propose an otherwise unattested transposition accompanying the substitution: *του* $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$ *ημων* $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ *ϵμπροϲθϵν κτλ.* But this has the same number of letters. By adding *του* we make the counts 46, 42, and 46.

fragment of a codex of the Pauline Corpus, Römer estimates that with all the epistles the codex would have occupied 230 pages and thus have been similar to 𝔓46.[76] The only direct clue that this codex ever contained more than Phlm is the remains of some letters after the end of v. 25. As Römer notes, these could be from the title of the next book but more probably come from repetition of the title of Phlm at the end of the book.

The only singular reading of 𝔓87 occurs in v. 25, where the scribe writes the closing greeting as η χαρις μεθ υμων.[77] Of course, we might think that the scribe would have been more likely to write this shorter greeting in v. 25 if he had recently seen the shorter form at Col. 4: 18, 1 Tim. 6: 21, and 2 Tim. 4: 22.[78]

It seems that the only variation unit at which 𝔓87 can be cited with confidence is at v. 14 where the space requires that 𝔓87 agrees with D* in omitting κατα *sec.* (F G K 0278 462 read κατα̣). This omission could have been the result of a scribal leap (αλλα̲ κατα̲), which might have occurred independently in 𝔓87 and D. Earlier in v. 14 only κατ [survives in 𝔓87, so we are unable to decide whether it had κατα αναγκην with ℵ A Ψ *rell* or κατ αναγκην with D* F G 69 442 1518.

After υμων in v. 25 the space of about one letter is all that is visible of the line, and Wachtel and Witte suggest that perhaps αμην followed after a space. This does seem possible, although the possibility seems to be ignored in Nestle-Aland. The space does seem to make it likely that 𝔓87 omitted αμην with A D* 048vid 6 33 81 1739* 1881 *pc*, whereas ℵ C D1 Ψ 0278 1739c 𝔐 have αμην.

Given the agreement with D* at v. 14, the likely agreement with A D* at v. 25, and the possible agreement with D* F G at v. 14, it is surprising that Aland and Aland classify 𝔓87 as a normal text. In fact, from what we have (minimal as it is), the papyrus, apart from its singular reading at v. 25, could agree throughout with D*. (Note that F and G both end with εν χ̅ρ̅ω̅ of v. 20, and B is not extant for the book.)

15

𝔓92 consists of fragments of two folios, dated to the late third or early fourth century. The first folio contains Eph. 1: 11–13 (1v) and 1: 19–21 (1r); the second contains 2 Thess. 1: 4–5 (2v) and 1: 11–12 (2r). It is thus evident that we

[76] P.Köln 4, 30. In fact, Trobisch, *Entstehung*, 112 n. 16, has even speculated that 𝔓87 could have been part of a supplement to 𝔓46.

[77] Although only μ]εθ υμων is extant, the space shows conclusively that only η χαρις preceded. Römer (31) sees merely a 'Flüchtigkeit des Schreibers'.

[78] This reasoning would be even more persuasive if Titus (with its slightly longer greeting) came after Philemon, as Römer (30) thinks more probable.

have the remains of a codex of the Pauline Corpus, although the extent and order cannot be deduced.

There are two corrections. At Eph. 1: 11 the correction is simply of an omitted *και*, which *Ψ pc* also omit. At Eph. 1: 19 the scribe, after writing *τι το*, returned to *τις ο* of v. 18,[79] and started to repeat *πλουτος της δοξης*. At some point he noticed the error, struck through *πλουτος* and perhaps some further text, and replaced it with a supralinear *υπερβαλλον*, and continued with the usual text. There are no singular readings, although perhaps some word was omitted at 2 Thess. 1: 4 according to Wachtel and Witte.

The text is generally Alexandrian. At Eph. 1: 20 it has *καθισας* without *αυτον*, agreeing with B 0278 104 365 1175 1505 1739 1881 *pc*. And at Eph. 1: 21 it seems likely from the space that it had *εξουσιας και αρχης* with B alone. On the other hand, at Eph. 1: 20 it has *επουρανοις* with most witnesses instead of *ουρανοις* as found in B 365 629 *pc*, and at 2 Thess. 1: 4 it has *ανεχεσθε* with all other witnesses instead of *ενεχεσθε* as found in B alone. Elsewhere 𝔓[92] agrees with ℵ B, sometimes against D F G (as with *προθεσιν* without *του θεου* at Eph. 1: 11), and sometimes with D F G (as with *εκ νεκρων* at Eph. 1: 20, instead of *εκ των νεκρων* with 𝔓[46] L *al*).

16

𝔓[113] is a small fragment of a codex from the third century, containing Rom. 2: 12–13 (recto) and 29 (verso). Cockle calculated that the codex contained either two or three columns; however, since codices with three columns are very rare (B is one of them), and none is as early as 𝔓[113], Cockle infers that the codex had two columns (like 𝔓[118]). In fact, the column of the surviving text is quite narrow, consisting of no more than thirteen letters (as it seems). The only readings of any note for which 𝔓[113] can be cited are 2: 13 (*νομου prim.* instead of *του νομου*) and 2: 29 (*ο επαινος* instead of *επαινος*), and at both it sides with all the earlier and weightier witnesses (i.e. ℵ A B D G (F is not extant here)). Thus, as far as we can tell it has a strict text.

17

𝔓[114] contains Heb. 1: 7–12, and is dated to the third century. Although there is writing only on the recto, the editor thinks it likely that it is part of a codex and that the verso was either blank or contained only the title. What survive are only a few letters at (or near) the beginning of ten lines, so that there is

[79] As noted by Gallazzi, 121, followed by Wachtel and Witte.

considerable uncertainty about some of the readings. According to the editor's reconstruction, the lines vary from thirty-six letters (line 9) to forty-two letters (lines 6 and 7).

One problematic place is at line 2 (1: 8), where the editor has: *cọυ ο* $\overline{\theta c}$ *ϵ̣[ιc τον αιωνα και η ραβδοc τηc ευθυτητοc]* = B 33. This has thirty-nine letters. But one could also plausibly restore as follows: *cọυ ο* $\overline{\theta c}$ *ϵ̣[ιc τον αιωνα του αιωνοc ραβδοc ευθυτητοc η]* = D² Ψ 0278 1881 𝔐. This has forty-two letters. So, did 𝔓¹¹⁴ support a reading shared with B 33 only or with the eventual majority reading against all the early manuscripts? Unfortunately, we also cannot tell whether 𝔓¹¹⁴ read the distinctive reading *αυτου* (𝔓⁴⁶ ℵ B) for *cου* at 1: 8, or whether it read *ανομιαν* (𝔓⁴⁶ B D² [-*μιαc* D*] Ψ 0243 0278 1739 1881 𝔐) or *αδικιαν* (ℵ A 33^vid *pc*) at 1: 9.

The editor gives no reconstruction at l. 5, which begins: *cου ο* $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ [. It is thus clear that the papyrus has some unusual reading here, since *cου ο θϵοc* is otherwise unreported. As Cockle states, a simple transposition would make l. 5 too long, and so, apart from the transposition, we need to postulate an otherwise unattested reading, probably an omission, in 1: 9.

Thus, it seems that we are unable to cite 𝔓¹¹⁴ at any variation among the early manuscripts, except for saying that at 1: 8 it probably agreed with either B 33 or D² Ψ 0278 1881 𝔐, and that it had some otherwise unknown reading(s) at 1: 9.

18

𝔓¹¹⁸ consists of four small fragments of Rom. 15–16 from one folio of a codex. Its writing is similar to that of 𝔓⁶⁶, and thus the text is dated to the third century. Unusually among early codices, it is written in two columns (as is likely 𝔓¹¹³).

There is one correction; at 16: 12 the singular *τρυφαναν* is changed to *τρυφαιναν*, apparently by the scribe. And there are two small slips: at 15: 26 𝔓¹¹⁸ 460 618 1646 1738 write *αχαιαν* for *αχαια* (probably under the influence of the following *κοινωνιαν*, as Schenke says), while at 16: 7 𝔓¹¹⁸ alone has the future *αcπαcϵcθϵ* for the aorist imperative *αcπαcαcθϵ*.

The text of 𝔓¹¹⁸ is generally Alexandrian, usually agreeing with ℵ A B, which 𝔓⁴⁶ sometimes joins. Where ℵ A B diverge, 𝔓¹¹⁸ goes with two: at 15: 32 it sides with ℵ* A C 1739 (*cυναναπαυcωμαι υμιν*), where 𝔓⁴⁶ B agree alone in omitting the phrase; at 16: 6a it has *μαριαν* with A B C 1739 against *μαριαμ* in 𝔓⁴⁶ ℵ (and D F G); and at 15: 33 it has *αμην* with ℵ B C D 𝔐 against 𝔓⁴⁶ A (and F G). Apart from the slips noted earlier, 𝔓¹¹⁸ never departs from more than one of ℵ A B.

19

$\mathfrak{P}^{123}$ is a portion of one folio, which contains 1 Cor. 14: 31–4, 15: 3–6. The editor states that it is probably from the earlier part of the fourth century.

The text agrees throughout with Nestle-Aland, except for reading πνευμα at 14: 32 with D F G K Ψ* 1241ˢ *pc*, where Nestle-Aland has πνευματα with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ A B and most witnesses. Elsewhere $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$ agrees everywhere with ℵ B, and differs from A only at 14: 33 (where $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$ has ακαταστασιας ο θεος, where A has ο θεος ακαταστασιας), although it is unclear whether at 15: 5 $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$ reads ειτα with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ B D^2 Ψ 1739 𝔐 or επειτα with ℵ A 33 *pc*. Apart from the cited reading at 14: 32, $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$ goes against the distinctive readings of D F G, such as και μετα ταυτα (D* F G) for ειτα or επειτα at 15: 5, or τη τριτη ημερα (F G *pm*) at 15: 4. Again apart from 14: 32, $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$ agrees consistently with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ except for the latter's singular omission of ταις in 14: 33 and (probably) also the latter's writing αλ for αλλ in the same verse.

20

0220 consists of one folio containing Rom. 4: 23–5: 3 (recto) and 5: 8–13 (verso), dated to the late third century. It is the earliest witness to this portion of Romans, since $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ begins at 5: 17.

There is one correction: at 5: 3 the itacistic θλειψις is changed to θλιψις. The only singular reading occurs at 5: 3, where 0220 has after δε some addition that is longer than the attested τουτο, as found in D* ar; Hatch suggested αδελφοι, while Limongi suggests καυχωμενοι.

The text differs from that of B at four places: 4: 24 (εγειροντα with A only, instead of εγειραντα), 5: 1 (εχομεν with $\aleph^1$ B^2 F G P Ψ *pm*, instead of εχωμεν with ℵ* A B* C D *pm*), 5: 3 (the singular addition), and 5: 11 (χριστου with ℵ A C D F G Ψ 𝔐, which B 1739 1881ᶜ *pc* omit). 0220 agrees with B against most other witnesses at 5: 2 (omit (εν) τη πιστει) and 5: 3 (καυχωμενοι instead of καυχωμεθα); at the former D F G join B 0220. The codex goes with ℵ A B C against D F G at 5: 9 (ουν), 5: 11 (*om.* τουτο after δε), and 5: 12 (ο θανατος *sec.*).

CONCLUSION

Most, if not all, of our manuscripts were found in Egypt, and we may presume that most of them were written there. Our evidence is thus not distributed geographically, yet there is reason to think that even such restricted evidence

may be representative of manuscripts from throughout the Mediterranean world during this early period.[80]

Let us first consider what books are (or were) represented among our twenty manuscripts.[81] For $\mathfrak{P}^{12}$, of course, it is clear that only Heb. 1: 1 was written. But three manuscripts certainly preserve more than one book: $\mathfrak{P}^{30}$ (1 Thess., 2 Thess.), $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ (Rom., Heb., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Eph., Gal., Phil., Col., 1 Thess.), and $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$ (Eph., 2 Thess.). $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ probably contained some and possibly contained all of the remaining Pauline letters. From the column numbering it seems very likely that $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ contained one book before Hebrews. Furthermore, if $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{65}$ are parts of one codex, then it contained Eph. and 1 Thess. originally. The remaining manuscripts (i.e. most of our witnesses here) preserve only one book, and it is thus completely uncertain whether other books were originally included. We are free to speculate that those manuscripts are the tiny remnants of once extensive manuscripts of the entire corpus, but it is also perfectly possible that they originally contained only one book.

Only for $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ is it possible to draw some firm inferences about the original order and extent of the letters, although even there we are left with uncertainty about its final contents. From the page numbering in $\mathfrak{P}^{30}$, it would seem that what remains was toward the end of a manuscript of the corpus. It is also certainly plausible to suppose that $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$, as well as $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, were manuscripts of the corpus, although we can hardly be confident about the order of their contents or what other letters were included. Nevertheless, I would think that it is likely that $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$ originally contained the corpus, since it seems implausible that a collection would be formed of Eph. and 2 Thess. only. It is tempting to think the same about $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$. So, of our twenty manuscripts it seems reasonable to think that four are manuscripts of the corpus: $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{30}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$. Of course, there is nothing to exclude that all twenty once contained the corpus.

If we look at which books are preserved among the extant manuscripts, we find the following pattern:

Rom.7	MSS ($\mathfrak{P}^{10}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{27}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{113}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{118}$, 0220)
Heb.5	MSS ($\mathfrak{P}^{12}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{17}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{114}$)
1 Cor.3	MSS ($\mathfrak{P}^{15}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$)
Eph.3	MSS ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$)
1 Thess.3	MSS ($\mathfrak{P}^{30}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{65}$)
Phil.2	MSS ($\mathfrak{P}^{16}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$)
2 Thess.2	MSS ($\mathfrak{P}^{30}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$)

[80] See *Scribal Habits*, 15–17, on this point; I there rely on important studies by E. J. Epp.

[81] Cf. the attached Chart 5, 'The Textual Contents of New Testament Papyri', in Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, although it covers only the papyri through $\mathfrak{P}^{96}$.

2 Cor.1 MS ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$)
Gal.1 MS ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$)
Col.1 MS ($\mathfrak{P}^{46}$)
Tit.1 MS ($\mathfrak{P}^{32}$)
Phlm.1 MS ($\mathfrak{P}^{87}$)

Despite the fortuitous nature of our evidence, some observations and questions are perhaps justified. Among the longer books, Romans and Hebrews seem particularly well represented, while 1 Corinthians and especially 2 Corinthians seem sparsely represented. Might we speculate that the earlier portions of a codex (if indeed Hebrews often came after Romans) tended to survive?[82] Or do we have evidence here that in fact the books circulated independently, and that Romans and Hebrews were particularly popular?[83] The brevity of Titus and Philemon could account for their appearing in only one manuscript each. But why should Ephesians appear in three, while Galatians appears in only one? Is the absence of 1 and 2 Timothy from our list simply a matter of chance, or does it reflect some lesser status of the Pastoral Epistles?

The special good fortune that $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ brings is apparent. Without it there would be three other books (2 Cor., Gal., Col.) with no early representation. And there would be no evidence at all concerning the order of books. We might, for example, conjecture that some Pauline letter or letters preceded Hebrews in $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, but who would have thought of Romans?

Turning to issues of textual relationships, we see that the Alexandrian text (i.e. the text as found in such later manuscripts as א A B C 33 1739) predominates in our papyri. Looking at variation-units where the major witnesses disagree, we see that twelve of our twenty manuscripts agree very frequently or even exclusively with the Alexandrian witnesses against the Western text (i.e. the text as found in such later manuscripts as D F G) and against the Byzantine text (i.e. the text as found in such later manuscripts as L 049 and most minuscules). These manuscripts are: $\mathfrak{P}^{16}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{17}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{27}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{30}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{65}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{118}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$, and 0220.

Four of our manuscripts agree generally with the Alexandrian text, but also have a significant number of agreements with the Western text or even the Byzantine text: $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{15}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$. And $\mathfrak{P}^{87}$ might even have agreed consistently with D, although it is too fragmentary to be at all confident about this. Then we have left $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{12}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{113}$, where the evidence is too limited to discern the textual character.

[82] However, it is commonly noted that the beginning and end of a codex were the most susceptible to loss (as notably in $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$).

[83] It is interesting that of all the verses in the Pauline Corpus, $\mathfrak{P}^{12}$ chose to write Heb. 1: 1.

Of special interest is $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, which is perhaps the oldest of our manuscripts of Paul. This codex is the most extensive of all the papyri, so that we have sufficient evidence to draw firm conclusions about both its textual relations and its scribal habits. As noted in more detail above, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ agrees much more often with the Alexandrian text than with the Western text, and its Alexandrian connection is reinforced by a significant number of agreements with B alone or almost alone. But $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ also frequently sides with the Western text. We thus find here the troublesome 'mixture' (viewed anachronistically with reference to the later witnesses) characteristic of $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ and other early papyri. Further important evidence is furnished by some of the corrections and conflated readings in $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$. Here we can see the scribe or other corrector choosing among competing readings, and sometimes these competing readings are later found divided between the Alexandrian and Western texts.

The next most extensive of our manuscripts, $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, also displays significant closeness to the Alexandrian text in general and to both $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and B in particular. Indeed, $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, and B display some agreements alone or almost alone that suggest some special point of overlap in their ancestries. Of course, there are also important differences, especially the agreements that $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ shares with D F G, and the agreements that $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ have (separately) with the Byzantine witnesses.

In making judgments about scribal errors and the accuracy of these early manuscripts, we are on firm ground with $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ and especially $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$. A survey of the scribal habits of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ as displayed in its singular readings reveals the great variety of ways in which one scribe can corrupt the text. But we also see clear tendencies, especially the tendency to omit portions of the text, ranging from single short words to long phrases, often by scribal leaps. Such omissions can also be seen in our other manuscripts; see the discussions of $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{15}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{16}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{87}$. We also see the occasional example of conflation in $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ (e.g. Phil. 1: 11, as noted earlier) and $\mathfrak{P}^{16}$ (Phil. 4: 7). The profile of singular readings in $\mathfrak{P}^{30}$ is especially interesting as that scribe seems to tend to create longer readings; three of its four singular readings appear to involve the addition of words. It is thus an exception among our early manuscripts.[84]

The manuscripts other than $\mathfrak{P}^{13}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ have small amounts of text, and it is always possible that the few lines preserved are places where the scribe was unusually accurate or unusually inaccurate. Nevertheless, we find varying patterns of corruption. A few of the manuscripts display considerable inaccuracy: $\mathfrak{P}^{10}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{16}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$. But several other manuscripts seem to be very accurate in reproducing their exemplar: $\mathfrak{P}^{17}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{27}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{113}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{118}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$. Moreover, accuracy in copying does not seem to correlate with the textual

[84] See *Scribal Habits*, 705–36.

relations. Among the twelve manuscripts with Alexandrian leanings we find three inaccurate scribes ($\mathfrak{P}^{16}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{40}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{49}$) and six accurate scribes ($\mathfrak{P}^{17}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{27}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{92}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{118}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{123}$).

Thus, despite the small amount of text in most of the manuscripts studied here, we have many interesting and important bits of evidence concerning the transmission of the Pauline Epistles in the first few centuries, evidence that sheds light on the earliest text and how it was copied.

11

The Early Text of the Catholic Epistles

J. K. Elliott

Text-critical work on the so-called Catholic (General) Letters, that is, James, 1, 2 Peter, 1, 2, 3 John, Jude, has benefited from the recent and reliable research tools on these letters published by the Münster Institut in preparation for its primary goal of producing a New Tischendorf, its *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior* (= *ECM* hereafter). These include *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus* I *Die katholischen Briefe*[1] and the first volumes in the series *Text und Textwert* (especially vol. i. *Die katholischen Briefe,* 1. *Das Material*[2]). The latter contain a significant number (ninety-eight) of its well-chosen *Teststellen*. (There are twenty-five test passages for James, i.e. numbers 1–25; thirteen for 1 Peter, 26–38; fourteen for 2 Peter, 39–52; twenty-three(!) for 1 John, 53–75; seven for 2 John, 76–82; five for 3 John, 83–7; eleven for Jude, 88–98.) At least in those places we have an unprecedented, almost exhaustive, number of variants from all accessible and legible manuscripts.

The first fascicles of the *ECM* with its spacious and clear *apparatus criticus* have been justifiably well received by critics.[3] The installments are:

> volume iv. *Catholic Letters,* 1. James (1997); 2. 1 and 2 Peter (2000); 3. 1 John (2003); 4. 2 and 3 John and Jude (2005). Each text volume is numbered part 1 and is accompanied by a second part of *Supplementary Material/Begleitende Materialen*. We are still awaiting the promised third part *Begleitende Untersuchungen*, apparently to be known as *Supplementary Studies* in English (see pp. 11*, B41–2, B91, B127, B145) and, according to the latest table of contents,

[1] Ed. K. Junack and W. Grunewald (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1986).

[2] K. Aland, ed., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments,* i, ii/1, ii/2, iii (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987).

[3] Among my own reviews see the article on installment 2 'The Petrine Epistles in the *Editio Critica Maior*', *NovT* 42 (2000): 328–39 and the book reviews of instalment 1 in *NovT* 40 (1998): 195–204; instalment 3 in *TLZ* 129 (2004): cols. 1068–71; instalment 4 in *TLZ* 131 (2006): cols. 1156–9.

in *ECM* iv/2, parts 3 and 4, this will now be a fifth *Lieferung/Instalment* (rather than *Teil/Part* 3).

Here in *ECM* one has ready access to the principal variants reported in manuscripts written in the first Christian millennium. The text itself disappointed those who were expecting a more radically different text from that in Nestle[27] or the United Bible Societies' Greek Testament 4th revised edition (= NA/UBS). The changes found in the critically edited text are two for James (originally[4]); seven for 1 Peter; eight for 2 Peter; three for 1 John; four for Jude. Details relating to James and 1 and 2 Peter are found in my Noster Conference article;[5] those on the Johannine letters and Jude may be found in my review in *TLZ* (see n. 3). The changes in James, 1 and 2 Peter, and 1 John are discussed in my contribution to the Earle Ellis *Festschrift*.[6] The added change made to James came in the light of subsequent investigation in Münster using Gerd Mink's developing Local Genealogical Coherence Method.[7] Possibly other changes may emerge as that methodology is applied more rigorously.

What was encouraging was that the editors were prepared to move away, albeit only hesitatingly, from the text of NA, at one time seemingly promoted as a Standard Text, almost an immutable Textus Receptus *redivivus*, especially given the fact that allied publications such as Aland's *Synopsis*, the Computer *Konkordanz,* and Bauer-Aland *Wörterbuch*[6] among other tools were based on NA, thus potentially inhibiting any further changes to that text and making any future alterations logistically, and even commercially, unattractive.

Also, and even more encouraging, the editors indicate by means of a bold dot certain places in their text where they were seemingly prepared to allow for an alternative reading to be considered 'of equal value' to the running text at the head of each page.[8] There are eleven such dotted alternatives in James, twenty-five in 1 Peter, sixteen in 2 Peter, thirteen in 1 John, two in 2 John, three in 3 John, and ten(!) in Jude (including two places in Jude 18 where

[4] A third place of change was announced in a footnote to the volume on the Letters of Peter (iv/2, part 1, p. 24* n. 4).

[5] J. K. Elliott, 'The *Editio Critica Maior*: One Reader's Reactions', in W. Weren and D.-A. Koch, eds., *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism* (Assen: van Gorcum, 2003), 129–44.

[6] J. K. Elliott, 'Changes to the Exegesis of the Catholic Epistles in the Light of the Text in the *Editio Critica Maior*', in Sang-Won (Aaron) Son, ed., *History and Exegesis in Honor of Dr. Earle E. Ellis* (New York and London: T&T Clark, 2006), 324–39.

[7] See his 'Was verändert sich in der Textkritik durch die Beachtung genealogischer Kohärenz?' in Weren and Koch, *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism*, 39–68.

[8] That at least is according to the Introduction on p. 11*. This position seemed to have been retracted in a later fascicule on p. 24* where we are now perplexed to read: 'Sometimes it [the bold dot] signals alternative readings which were considered of equal value. Sometimes the reasons for the reading in the primary line were regarded as superior, but not sufficiently to rule out with complete confidence the claims of the indicated alternative reading. In any event the dot indicates a passage which calls for special critical consideration.'

acceptance of the alternative, dotted, readings would have the effect of restoring the text as read in NA^{27}).[9]

When we turn to the earliest witnesses (i.e. those manuscripts whose date of writing is now given by palaeographers to precede the writing of the great codices א and B) obviously not all those verses where changes in the text or alternative readings are signalled happen to occur in any of these fragmentary witnesses. The main exceptions are in 1 and 2 Peter and Jude, the text of which is found more or less in its entirety in $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ (see below). Three places in James where dots occur are found below (under manuscript $\mathfrak{P}^{20}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{100}$) and 2 in 1 Peter under 0206.

THE CANON[10]

Although the great codices א and B of the fourth century and A and C of the fifth century include all seven Catholic Epistles together, it is only in the seventh century that we have a manuscript ($\mathfrak{P}^{74}$) that has the eight books (i.e. Acts plus the Catholic Epistles) found united as an item, a category that became normative.[11] There are about thirty manuscript copies containing the Catholic Epistles in their entirety or partially (of which a few also contain Acts) up to the ninth century.[12] It is significant that in several manuscripts this hybrid assemblage of letters was combined with Acts—also a book with an unsettled text.[13] The seven letters are disparate, an odd mixture indeed. Six were accepted, presumably because of their attribution to the prominent triumvirate of early apostles (ironically labelled ‘pillars’ by Paul), and those were then ordered by length of writing and in the sequence of letters allegedly composed by James, Peter, and John to follow this ranking of these apostles found (in at least some manuscripts) in Gal. 2: 9.

In the survey here $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ contains 1 and 2 Peter and Jude, the other papyri fragments contain only one of the seven. In those cases one does not know

[9] Those passages in James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1 John are discussed in my ‘Changes to the Exegesis’.

[10] E. J. Epp, ‘Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon’, in L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 485–515 reprinted as ch. 21 in E. J. Epp, *Perspectives in New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 595–639.

[11] For the problems arising from the combining of the Catholic Epistles and Acts in the normal listing of New Testament MSS in one category (designated ‘a’) see J. K. Elliott, ‘The Greek Manuscript Heritage of the Book of Acts’, *FilNeo* 17 (1996): 32–50.

[12] See D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 284–5.

[13] For a recent textual commentary on the main textual differences in Acts see J. Rius-Camps and J. Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae* (4 vols. New York: T&T Clark, 2004–9). See also Ch. 9 of the present volume.

how extensive the original text was, and in at least one case (𝔓[78]) we ask if it is really a legitimate continuous text of Jude to merit inclusion in the official register (the *Liste*[14]).

The fourfold Gospels seem to have emerged and to have been accepted as authoritative early and certainly before the New Testament canon was eventually agreed upon and fixed. The Pauline Corpus also seems to have been established relatively early, even if Trobisch's theories are discounted.[15] That is not true of Revelation whose eventual but late acceptance into the canon was slow, especially in the East, a state of affairs which, combined with its poor and difficult Greek, doubtless created the distinctiveness of many of the textual characteristics of this book. It is also not true of the seven Catholic Epistles.

The canonical status of some of the Catholic Epistles seems to have given rise to cause for concern, and this fact may have influenced the lack of care with which copyists treated the texts. The Syriac Peshitta lacks 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude. Metzger[16] notes that Origen had occasional doubts about James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John. The canonical status of each letter may well have affected the way in which their text was copied, in the same way as the apocryphal writings exhibit a relatively free textual tradition with frequent additions, contractions, and exegetical changes.[17] Those points need to be remembered as we examine the early manuscript heritage of the Catholic Epistles below. Also, we shall be asking ourselves what the original function of each manuscript was. A manuscript written for the liturgical needs of a Christian community may have been more carefully executed than one that was intended to serve the apologetic needs of an individual, especially if that person's 'orthodoxy' was questionable.

TEXT TYPES

The Münster Institut has ceased using the old nomenclature of text types, thanks to its adoption of Mink's methodology. That state of affairs was already anticipated in the *Text und Textwert* series where manuscripts were not grouped by the old categories, Western, Alexandrian, etc. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts,* pp. 171–4, has rightly indicated

[14] K. Aland *et al., Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd edn. (New York: de Gruyter, 1994) and now online.

[15] D. Trobisch, *Paul's Letter Collection* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).

[16] B. M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 139.

[17] J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993) indicates where many of these non-canonical texts have major rewritings.

that these terms are awkward and no longer appropriate for use throughout the New Testament.

Eldon J. Epp has tried in several places[18] to redefine these obsolescent categories. In his sense (and commonsense it is too) something approximating to these old terms may be applied to designate certain key manuscripts which throughout, but not necessarily consistently, betray haphazard agreements with a coterie of allies.[19] Thus he can speak of an 'A' type for those manuscripts allied to manuscript A and which represent in effect the old Byzantine type in certain books; a 'B' type allied to manuscript B; a mixed 'C' type between the 'B' and 'D' groupings but close to manuscript W; and a 'D' type close to Codex Bezae.

But, in an electronic age when there is an increasingly larger and growing number of accessible and newly collated witnesses, the use of the over-sophisticated proto-Alexandrian, pre-Caesarean as well as the conventional catch-alls, Byzantine, Western, etc., are anachronistic remnants of an earlier period of New Testament textual criticism. Despite all this, we use 'Byz' below, following the example set by the *apparatus* in *ECM*.

TEXT VALUES

Insofar as these judgements have any relevance or value, we note that Aland and Aland[20] classify the papyri in the following way: 𝔓⁹ free text?; 𝔓²⁰ normal; 𝔓²³ strict; 𝔓⁷² normal in 1 and 2 Peter; free in Jude; 𝔓⁷⁸ free; 𝔓⁸¹ normal.[21] For them 'normal' means a normal transmission of the original(!) text with a limited amount of variation characteristic of the New Testament textual tradition; 'free' means that there is a greater degree of variation than in the 'normal' category; a 'strict' text reproduces the text with a greater fidelity than that in the 'normal' text.

In this sense it is bizarre that the designations 'strict', 'neutral', 'free' of the text should still be deemed applicable to our earliest witnesses, when all that

[18] Most notably in his 'The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 1989), repr. with an update in Epp, *Perspectives*, 345–81.

[19] A similar concentration on certain, key MSS to indicate moments in the history of Mark's Gospel may be seen in the work of the Marc multilingue project explained online at http://www.safran.be/marcmultilingue.

[20] K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 96–102, 93. A&A hereafter.

[21] This qualification for 𝔓⁸¹ occurs not in A&A but in *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus, i ad loc.*

should be noted is the extent to which any very early witnesses' readings (especially in places where it is already known and recorded that our extant stock of manuscripts exhibits significant variation) are to be found again in other (inevitably) later witnesses. By definition, the earliest witnesses cannot be said to exhibit a 'strict', 'free', or 'normal' character, merely that their variants may or may not be found later in a significant number of other manuscripts or indeed in any other later manuscript. It is those *later* witnesses that may or may not be said to adhere strictly to a form of words that already exists.

In addition, to judge an early manuscript (or any manuscript, for that matter) by its level of agreement with the Nestle text attributes to the text in that editorially concocted printed edition an unwarranted superiority, and betrays an arrogance worthy only of ruthless marketing ploys. Although the editors are evaluating the papyri using terms like 'strict' or 'free', another classification is also applied by the Alands (I, II, etc.) and those categories are extended to other manuscripts as well.

All but one of the papyri in my survey are graded by the Alands as category I, that is, according to p. 106, 'of special quality'(!) by virtue of their age. Only $\mathfrak{P}^{81}$ is category II because of alien Byzantine influence![22] All papyri before the third/fourth century are the highest category because of their age even for those with a 'free' text which 'sets them at a distance from the original [*sic*] text'.

As Metzger rightly states:[23]

> [The categories given by Aland and Aland to manuscripts (I, II etc.)] do not assist researchers interested in knowing which family groups have been established based on the *Teststellen*. Moreover there is a peculiar kind of circularity in this approach to classification since if one of the purposes in grouping witnesses is to assist in establishing the 'original text' it makes little sense to prejudge the issue by classifying witnesses precisely by how well they attest the original text!

D. C. Parker on several occasions in his *Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts* claims, rightly, that the judgements and results applied to the textual history of the Gospels cannot be applied to any other of the conventional subdivisions of the New Testament, a/c, p, or r. We may take that even further in the case of the Catholic Epistles. Generally, each of these letters has to be considered separately. In the light of the *ECM* fascicles we may indeed say that what may be true for James does not necessarily apply to 1 Peter, and that 1 Peter needs to be examined separately from 2 Peter. The manuscripts deemed closest to the *Ausgangstext* in 1 John differ from those identified for 2

[22] A&A, 95.

[23] B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 4th edn. (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 238.

John and so forth, as may be seen in *ECM* 35*f. Although *ECM* speaks of the brevity of the text in 2 John, 3 John, Jude, the number of textual variants is high: 104 *v.ll.* in 2 John, 95 in 3 John, 204 in Jude.[24] And in Jude especially several units have multiple variants, as we may readily observe in the *apparatus* of *ECM* in the following verses (numbers in brackets following the verse number are the numerical indicators ('addresses') for each word and space in this edition): 10 *v.ll.* at 1 (26–34); 13 *v.ll.* at 4 (48–58); 31! *v.ll.* at 5 (12–20); 10 *v.ll.* at 14 (28–32); 11 *v.ll.* at 15 (20–8); 19 *v.ll.* at 18 (8–14); 16 *v.ll.* at 23 (2–22); 19 *v.ll.* at 25 (40–52).

WITNESSES

There are eight papyri containing parts of the Catholic letters (plus one further papyrus that is awaiting publication) which may be dated earlier than the fourth century, and one uncial/majuscule fragment on parchment (see Table 11.1).

This means that we have early witnesses for the Catholic Epistles as follows:

James: $\mathfrak{P}^{20}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{23}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{100}$ plus an unpublished fragment (see below)[25]

1 Peter: $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ P^{81} $\mathfrak{P}^{125}$ 0206

2 Peter: $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$

1 John: $\mathfrak{P}^{9}$

Jude: $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{78}$

For 2 and 3 John our earliest witnesses are א and B of the fourth century. With the exception of $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ the manuscripts listed above consist of only one lacunose sheet (although the one page of $\mathfrak{P}^{78}$ is virtually intact).

VARIANTS AND AFFILIATIONS

Let us now examine the manuscripts to see who their allies are and how the text relates to that established in *ECM* iv. Analysis of the samples to follow,

[24] *ECM* devotes thirty-one quarto pages to dealing with the *v.ll.* in the twenty-five verses of Jude.

[25] On the text of James see D. C. Parker, 'The Development of the Critical Text of the Epistle of James: From Lachmann to the *Editio Critica Maior*', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 2002), 317–30. Repr. as ch. 16 in D. C. Parker, *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 203–16.

Table 11.1. Early Witnesses to the Catholic Epistles (2nd to mid-4th centuries)

Gr. Al. No.	*Editio princeps*	Date	Provenance	Size	Contents
𝔓9	B. P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* 3 (1903), 2–3	III	Oxyrhynchus	7.3 × 5.2cm	1 John 4:11–12; 4:14–16
𝔓20	A. S. Hunt, ed., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* 9 (1912), 9–11	III	Oxyrhynchus	11.5 × 4.3cm	James 2:19– 3:2; 3:3–9
𝔓23	B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* 10 (1914), 16–18	III	Oxyrhynchus	12.1 × 11.2cm	James 1:10–12; 1: 15–18
𝔓72	M. Testuz, ed., *Papyrus Bodmer* VII–IX, VII. *L'Épître de Jude;* VIII. *Les deux Épîtres de Pierre* (1959)	III/IV	Egypt (? Thebes)	15.5 × 14.2cm	1 and 2 Peter; Jude
𝔓78	L. Ingrams *et al.*, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* 34 (1968), 4–6	III/IV	Oxyrhynchus	2.9 × 5.3cm	Jude 4–5; 7–8
𝔓81	S. Daris, ed., *Un nuovo frammento della prima lettera di Pietro* (1967)	IV	Unknown	22 × 12.5cm	1 Peter 2:20–3:1; 3: 4–12
𝔓100	R. Hübner, ed., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* 75 (1998), 20–5	III/IV	Oxyrhynchus	19 × 7.5cm	James 3:13–4:4; 4:9–5:1
𝔓125	J. Chapa, ed., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* 73 (2009), 17–22	III/IV	Oxyrhynchus	15 × 9.5cm	1 Peter 1:23–2:5; 2:7–12
0206	B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* 11 (1915), 5–6	IV	Oxyrhynchus	14 × 10cm	1 Peter 5: 5–13

divided manuscript by manuscript into categories 'With *ECM*' and 'Against *ECM*', shows where the reading of these early witnesses has support elsewhere. Occasional unique or sub-singular readings by these papyri indicate the distinctiveness of the text. Although the purpose of the samples is not to judge the originality or secondariness of their readings, nonetheless brief comments on striking examples occasionally occur to indicate the likeliest direction of change.

P9

The spelling is poor and there are nonsense readings. The manuscript was probably written by a non-professional scribe for private use. *Nomina sacra* occur.

With ECM

1 John 4: 16 (10)[26]: πεπιστευκαμεν against πιστευομεν A 33 436 1067 1409 1735 2344 2541 only

4: 16 (66) μενει with ℵ B 018 020 against om. A *pler*.

Against ECM

1 John 4: 16 (22) P9 has a unique reading XC against θεος *cett*.

P20

Good orthography. Many itacisms and exchange of gutturals. *Nomina sacra* are found but πατηρ and ανθρωπων are written *plene*.

With ECM

James 2: 19 (15) om. και after θεος with P74 ℵ A B C Byz against + και 43 330 468 etc. The longer text may well be the original reading; it could have been omitted accidentally through hom[27] (*ΚαιΚαλως*) or deliberately expunged on stylistic grounds as another και follows.

2: 26 (27) om. των with P74 ℵ B *Ψ* against + των A C P Byz. The original reading would need to be determined after a study of the New Testament's and specifically this author's use of χωρις + / − the definite article.

3: 6 (17) om. ουτως with P74 ℵ A B C; ουτως P Byz; ουτως και L 056 *et al*.

3: 8 (8–14) ουδεις δαμασαι δυναται ανθρωπων with B C 945 1739 2298 only; ουδεις δυναται δαμασαι ανθρωπων is dotted in *ECM*—this is the reading of ℵ A and many others; among other *v.ll.* word-order *1,3–4,2* Byz. Wachtel discusses this (*Teststelle* 16) on pp. 230–1.[28]

[26] Numbers in brackets are the number addresses used in *ECM*.

[27] I prefer this term, coined by A. C. Clark, when homoioteleuton and the like would be inappropriate in MSS written in *scripio continua*.

[28] All references to Wachtel, given hereafter as 'Wachtel p. xxx' plus the Teststelle number (TS), are to K. Wachtel, *Der byzantinische Text der katholischen Briefe* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).

3: 9 (10) *κυριον* with ℵ *A B* C P and others; *θεον* Byz. The title 'Lord and Father' occurs nowhere else, which perhaps points to its originality here; the combination 'God and Father' is, of course, a commonplace one in the Greek Bible.

3: 9 (34) *θεου* with ℵ A B C Byz; *του θεου* is read by only relatively few witnesses, but its originality or secondariness need to be decided only after a study of the author's preferred usage.

There are of course here and in all the other examples given under the subheading 'With *ECM*' many places where our manuscript agrees with the bulk of witnesses in those variation units which are set out in *ECM* merely because an isolated manuscript or two happen to preserve a reading that goes against the running line of text.

Against ECM

James 2: 23 (16) omit *δε* with L *Ψ* and several minuscules; *δε* is read by ℵ A B C Byz

3: 5 (18–20) *μεγαλαυχει*[29] with ℵ *Ψ* Byz; *μεγαλα αυχει* is read by P74 A B C*.

3: 7 (24–8) *δεδαμασται και δαμαζεται* with C *pauci* against *3,2,1 cett*. Is the more logical sequence to write the perfect tense first? If so, was that in the author's mind or a corrector's?

P23

Good orthography. Itacisms *ι/ει*, *αι/ε*. No *nomina* sacra but *πατρος* is written *plene*.

With ECM

James 1: 11 (30) + *αυτου* with ℵ A B C Byz; om. 206 254 429 *pauci*

1: 12 (18) *λημψεται* with P74*vid* ℵ A B* 0246 1175 only, against *ληψεται cett*.

1: 12 (30–1) *επηγγειλατο* P74 ℵ A B *Ψ* 81 206T 996 1661 2344 only against + *κυριος* C *pauci*; + *ο κυριος* Byz; + *ο θεος* 322 323 (Wachtel pp. 208–10 TS 2)

1: 17 (22) *απο* with ℵ A B C Byz against *παρα* K 056 *pauci*; *εκ* 2374 2805

1: 17 (38) *ενι* with A B C Byz; *εστιν* ℵ and others

1: 18 (4) *απεκυησεν* with ℵ A B C Byz against *εποιησεν* 206 429 522 etc.

[29] 𝔓20 reads *μεγαναυχει* in which *λ* replaced *υ*[1] as a correction; this *λ* was then understood in the ed. *pr. to* be a ligature of *λα*.

Against ECM

James 1: 17 (40–6) παραλληγης η τροπης αποσκιασματος a singular reading against a variety of variants (eleven others in *ECM*) including παραλλαγη η τροπης αποσκιασμα (the reading of *ECM*) in א^{c}; A C Byz παραλλαγη η τροπης αποσκιασματος א* B only. (Wachtel pp. 210–14. TS 3)

𝔓72

The biblical texts appear within a composite manuscript, a miscellany of *c*.190 pages, in which iv. 1–36 contain 1 and 2 Peter (1–22, 23–36) and i. 62–8 contain Jude. Although 1 and 2 Peter are separated from Jude the same scribe probably wrote these three writings[30] in a codex that is a compendium of writings. The collection comprises the following: The Nativity of Mary (P. Bodmer V); the apocryphal correspondence between Paul and the Corinthians (P. Bodmer X); the eleventh Ode of Solomon (P. Bodmer XI); Jude (P. Bodmer VII); Melito, *On the Passover* (P. Bodmer XIII); fragment of a hymn (P. Bodmer XII); the *Apology* of Phileas (P. Bodmer XX); Psalms 33: 2–34: 16 LXX (P. Bodmer IX); 1 and 2 Peter (P. Bodmer VIII).

The origin and function of such a miscellany[31] give rise to much debate, but for our purposes it is sufficient to note that the New Testament writings were used here for a private individual. That may explain the distinctive features of the writing and text. There are many subheadings in the margin of 1 and 2 Peter but not Jude; there are many itacisms and some unique spellings. Erratic addition of breathings occurs; there are intermittent *corrigenda* by the original hand and a large number of singular readings. Coptic has influenced some spellings. The scribe was extremely careless, and there are many omissions.

What is important to note is that there seems to have been a theological tendency behind some of the changes, especially at 1 Peter 5: 1; 2 Peter 1: 2; Jude 5b. At 1 Peter 5: 1 we read in 𝔓72 that Peter witnesses to the sufferings of *God*. At 2 Peter 1: 2 𝔓72 omits και after God, thus allowing the reading '... our God Jesus Christ'. In Jude 5 𝔓72 reads that it was θεος χριστος who saved the people from Egypt. Thus in those three places the distinctive readings in 𝔓72 are conscious attempts to equate Jesus with God.[32]

30 According to T. Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2006).

31 T. Nicklas and T. Wasserman (ch. 7 in T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, eds., *New Testament Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2006)) call this the Bodmer Codex Miscellani (sic): I query what language this last word is!

32 They may be seen as deliberate anti-adoptionist readings in B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York: OUP, 1993), 85ff.

Édouard Massaux published two major articles in the 1960s subjecting the text of 𝔓72 to a detailed analysis and producing a full *apparatus* of readings[33] but Royse[34] in his chapter 8, especially pp. 553–5, points out many of Massaux's shortcomings, especially in the earlier of these two studies. Nevertheless, Massaux's conclusions are relevant. Of the text in Jude he writes at the end of his article: 'Ces conclusions nous amènent à croire que le Papyrus Bodmer VII est un témion de ces texts sauvages tels qu'il devait encore en circuler au III^e^ siècle.' A similar judgement comes at the end of his article on 1 Peter; that this text too is 'sauvage'. J. N. Birdsall[35] assessed those claims, arguing that the alleged 'wildness' is shared by some other sources such as Clement of Alexandria, the Liber Commicus, and the Philoxenian Syriac and thus cannot be construed as peculiar to 𝔓72.

Interestingly, the many parallels between Jude and 2 Peter (e.g. 2 Peter 2: 13 = Jude 12 *bis*; 2 Peter 2: 17 = Jude 12, 13; 2 Peter 3: 2 = Jude 17; 2 Peter 3: 3 = Jude 18) seem not to have resulted in harmonizations in 𝔓72, according to Wasserman, *Epistle of Jude*, 99–102.

With ECM

1 Peter (given the large extent of text in this manuscript, chapter 1 has been chosen as a sample).

1: 1 (20–6) + ασιας 𝔓74 ℵ^{c} *A B*^{c} *Ψ B*yz; om. ℵ* 048 1838 only

1: 7 (14) πολυτιμοτερον with P74 ℵ A B C K against πολυ τιμιωτερον Byz

1: 8 (6) ιδοντες with ℵ B C against ειδοτες A Byz, dotted in *ECM*

1: 10 (8–12) εξηραυνησαν with ℵ A B* 1175 only against Byz which reads the Attic form -ηρευ- (cf. 1: 11 below)

1: 10 (22–4) υμας with most witnesses against the reading ημας of K 0142 *pauci*

1: 11 (2) εραυνωντες the Hellenistic form is the original reading here supported by ℵ B* 1175 only, against the secondary, Attic, form ερευνωντες *rell.*

1: 12 (12) υμιν with ℵ A B C Byz against ημιν read by 61 94 104 etc.

1: 16 (8) εσεσθε with ℵ A B C against *v.ll.* γενεσθε read by K P; γινεσθε L

1: 17 (12) απροσωπολημπτως with ℵ A B* C 0142 1175 only, against απροσωποληπτως B^{c} Byz

[33] É. Massaux, 'Le Texte de l'Épître de Jude du Papyrus Bodmer VII', in *Scrinium Lovaniense* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1961), 108–25; id., 'Le Texte de la I^{a} Petri du Papyrus Bodmer VIII (𝔓72)', *ETL* 39 (1963): 616–71.

[34] James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

[35] 'The Text of Jude in 𝔓72', *JTS* 14 (1963): 394–9, repr. in J. N. Birdsall, *Collected Papers in Greek and Georgian Textual Criticism* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006).

1: 18 (24–8) The order *υμων αναστροφης πατροπαραδοτου* has the support of ℵ A B against *1, 3, 2* C *Ψ*

1: 20 (26) *υμας* with ℵ B C *pler* against *ημας* A *pauci*

1: 22 (19) omit *δια πνευματος* with ℵ A B C *Ψ*; inclusion by Byz (Wachtel pp. 242–4. TS 26)

1: 23 (27) omit *εις τον αιωνα* with ℵ A B C; words included by Byz cf. 1 Peter 1: 25 (Wachtel pp. 245–6. TS 28)

1: 24 (8) *ως* with B C Byz against *ωσει* ℵ* only; om. $ℵ^{c}$ A *Ψ*

1: 24 (18) *αυτης* with $ℵ^{c}$ A B C; *αυτου* ℵ* 629 only; *ανθρωπου* Byz

1: 24 (37) om. *αυτου* with ℵ A B; *αυτου* C Byz

Against ECM

1 Peter 1: 3 (26–32) unique word order *πολυ ελεος αυτου* (and omission of *το*)

1: 3 (34–6) unique *αναγεννησας* i.e. without *ημας* before or after

1: 4 (24) *ημας* with 5 43 *pauci*

1: 6 (18) *λυπηθεντες* with $ℵ^{c}$ A B C Byz, dotted in *ECM* against -*ας cett.*

1: 6 (22) *πολλοις* with 398 only, against *ποικιλοις cett.*

1: 7 (6) *δοκιμον* with 61 206 429* 522 1852 2138 2423 only (not with $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$ *pace* Metzger, *Commentary*[36]). cf. same *v.l.* at James 1: 3

1: 7 (8–12) *της πιστεως υμων* with 254 436 1067 against *ημων*, *1,2* 88 915 1848; *3,1–2 cett.*

1: 7 (22–8) *και δια πυρος* with 1243 2492 only, against *δια πυρος δε* P74 ℵ A B C Byz

1: 11 (26) *προμαρτυρουμενον* with A 025 049 against -*ομενον* ℵ B C Byz

1: 12 (36) om. *εν* with A B *Ψ* dotted in *ECM* against *εν* ℵ C Byz

1: 16 (10) *διοτι* with ℵ 81 181 321 1175 1845 2243 2718 only, against *οτι cett.* NB *διοτι* at beginning of the verse and cf. 1: 24

1: 16 (12–14) *εγω αγιος ειμι* with most manuscripts against *εγω αγιος* ℵ A* B 1735 only

1: 20 (18–22) almost unique *εσχατων χρονων* (with only 522) against *v.ll.* *εσχατου των χρονων* (= *ECM*); *εσχατου του χρονου*; *εσχατων των χρονων*

1: 21 (4–8) *δι αυτου πιστευοντας* with most manuscripts; *δι αυτου πιστους* A B 307Z 398 1735 only

[36] B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994).

1: 24 (2) οτι with 181C only; διο Ψ 1852 only; διοτι *rell.* cf. 1: 16

1: 25 (30–4) ευαγγελισθεν εις υμας is supported by most manuscripts; but note *2–3, 1* 𝔓72

With ECM

Jude[37] 1 (24) ηγαπημενοις with ℵ A B; ηγιασμενοις Byz (Wasserman pp. 242–4)

1 (26–34) ιησου χριστω with ℵ A B against χριστου ιησου Ψ *pauci; ιησου χριστου* P *et al.* (Wasserman p. 244)

3 (18–22) κοινης ημων σωτηριας with A B against om. ημων Byz (Wasserman p. 247. Wachtel pp. 344–6. TS 89)

4 (34) χαριτα with A B 38 only, against χαριν *cett.* (Wasserman p. 251)

6 (4) τε with ℵ B C Byz; δε A (Wasserman pp. 267–8)

7 (24–8) τροπον τουτοις εκπορνευσασαι with ℵ A B C; *2, 1, 3* K L Byz (Wasserman pp. 271–2)

9 (48) κυριος with A B C Byz; ο κυριος ℵ² and others; ο θεος ℵ* (Wasserman pp. 279–82)

12 (6) οι with ℵ² A B L; om. ℵ* K Byz (Wasserman pp. 285–6)

12 (19) om. υμιν with ℵ A B against + υμιν C (Wasserman pp. 28–9)
[12 (34) παραφερομεναι P72^c ℵ A C Byz; παραφερομενοι P72* B Ψ (Wasserman p. 289)]

12 (42–6) om. και with ℵ A B C Byz; + και 57 61 (Wasserman p. 290)

13 (30–4) om. τον with ℵ A B C; + τον *K* 049 (Wasserman pp. 294–5)

17 (12–16) ρηματων των προειρημενων with ℵ B C against *3, 1* A, dotted in *ECM* (Wasserman p. 310)

25 (3) om. σοφω with ℵ A B C; + σοφω Byz (Wasserman pp. 334–6. Wachtel pp. 375–8. TS 96). For this and the next *v.l.* compare the doxology at the end of Romans

25 (10–20) δια *I Y X Y* του *K Y* ημων with ℵ B C; om. K Byz (Wasserman p. 336. Wachtel pp. 376–8. TS 97)

Against ECM

Jude 4 (48–58) ημων δεσποτην και κυριον ιησουν χριστον ημων unique; ECM = *2, 3, 4, 1, 5, 6*. Note that 𝔓78 also has a unique reading here. (Wasserman pp. 251–4. Wachtel pp. 346–8. TS 90)

[37] References to the text-critical comments on these variants by Wasserman, *Text of Jude* are given as (Wasserman, pp. xxx).

5 (12–20) unique; *ECM* with B alone. There are many *v.ll* in this address, one dotted.[38] (Full discussions in Wasserman pp. 255–66 and Wachtel pp. 349–57. TS 91)[39]

13 (8) *απαφριζοντα* with C against *επαφριζοντα* ℵ A B Ψ in *ECM*. (Wasserman pp. 291–4, and see Flink, n. 38, pp. 111–14)

14 (26–32) unique word order *εν αγιων αγγελων μυριασιν* (Wasserman pp. 298–301)

18 (7) om. *οτι* with ℵ B L Ψ 61 2344 only; + *οτι* Byz, dotted in *ECM*. (Wasserman pp. 311–12. Wachtel p. 360. TS 93, and see Flink, n. 38, pp. 117–19)

20 (8–18) unique reading: *τη εαυτων αγιοτητι πιστει ανοικοδομεισθε* against a variety of other readings. (Wasserman pp. 316–18)

21 (10) *τηρησωμεν* with B C*vid* Ψ and six minuscules dotted in *ECM* against -*ησατε* ℵ A Byz. (Wasserman pp. 316–19)

21 (22–30) unique: om. *ημων* in (22) (with 1241 1735) and a new positioning (within 24–30) (Wasserman p. 319)

22 (2)–23 (22) unique rephrasing (full discussions in Wasserman pp. 320–31 and Wachtel pp. 361–73. TS 94)

24 (8–26) unique rephrasing (Wasserman pp. 331–2. Wachtel pp. 373–5. TS 95)

25 (4–8) unique: om. *σωτηρι* (Wasserman pp. 333–4)

25 (24–30) unique: *και μεγαλωσυνη* (Wasserman pp. 337–8)

25 (40–52) unique: *και νυν και εις τους παντας αιωνας* (Wasserman p. 338. Wachtel pp. 378–9. TS 98)

Kubo[40] compared 𝔓[72] with B. In 246 places where these manuscripts agree their text is 'superior' to others according to Kubo; where they disagree (some ninety-four times) 𝔓[72] is (in his opinion) more reliable than B.

𝔓[78]

The size of this manuscript suggests it comes either from a miniature codex (and therefore written for private use) or, more likely, is part of an amulet. If

[38] Wasserman's own reading looks like a conjecture if one accepts the variation unit in *ECM* instead of dividing the unit into four parts.

[39] See also Timo Flink, *Textual Dilemma* (Joensuu: University of Joensuu Press, 2009), ch. 3: 'Reconsidering the Text of Jude 5, 13, 15 and 18'. For this v.l. see pp. 98–111.

[40] S. Kubo, 'Textual Relationships in Jude', in J. K. Elliott, ed., Studies in New Testament Language and Text (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 276–82 and id., *P72 and Codex Vaticanus* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1965).

so, one wonders why this and certain other very fragmentary New Testament papyri merit inclusion in the register of continuous text manuscripts.[41] As an amulet it seems as if the content of the verses indicate that it served a malevolent purpose, wishing ill of non-conformers and alleged sinners by reminding them of the nature of divine punishment. Itacisms occur; *nomina sacra* are present.[42]

Against ECM

Jude 4 (48–58) unique (with 38) om. *και*, amid many *v.ll.* (Wachtel pp. 346–8. TS 90)

7 (50) *επεχουσαι* with 630 876 1505 1611 1832 and others, against *υπεχουσαι* with most witnesses. Other *v.ll* exist

8 (6–8) *και αυτοι* with 1735 1885T only, against *και αυτοι* *cett.*

$\mathfrak{P}^{81}$

Good orthography. No itacisms. Diacritical marks and *nomina sacra* are present.

With ECM *text*

1 Peter 2: 20 (31) omit *γαρ* with ℵ B C Byz; + *γαρ* A 33 *pauci*

2: 20 (35) omit *τω* with ℵ B C etc.; + *τω* A dotted in *ECM*.

2: 21 (7) omit *και* before *εκληθητε* with ℵ A B C; + *και* $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ 18 35 *pauci*

2: 24 (40) *ζησωμεν* with $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ ℵ A B etc.; *ζησομεν* with 398* 665* 1135 1661 1881T 2138* 2464 only; *συ(ν)ζωμεν* C 323 1241 1739 2298 2718 only

2: 24 (47) om. *αυτου*^{2} $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ A B C; *αυτου*^{2} ℵ* Byz

3: 6 (20–2) *εγενηθητε* with ℵ A B C; *εγεννηθητε* $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ K P

3: 7 (32) *συνκληρομενοις* with 33 69 *pauci*; *συγκληρονομοι* Byz; *συγκληρονομοις* $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ $\aleph^{c}$ B* 1175 1852

[41] There may be a case for making a separate collection of such witnesses according to S. R. Pickering, 'The Significance of the Non-Continuous New Testament Textual Materials in Papyri', in D. G. K. Taylor, ed., *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 1999), 121–41.

[42] A discussion of the likelihood that this fragment formed part of an amulet occurs as ch. 3 in Wasserman's thesis. This is a revision of an article by Wasserman, 'P78 (P. Oxy. XXXIV 2684): The Epistle of Jude on an Amulet?', in T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, eds., *New Testament Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 137–60.

3: 7 (34–6) *χαριτος ζωης* with B C* etc.; *ποικιλης χαριτος ζωης* ℵ B. The epithet was possibly borrowed from 4: 10, if secondary

3: 8 (18) *ταπεινοφρονες* with 𝔓[72] ℵ A B C; *φιλογρονες* K P 049 etc. (Wachtel pp. 249–50. TS 30)

3: 9 (26–32) *οτι* 𝔓[72] ℵ A B C; *ειδοτες οτι* Byz (Wachtel pp. 250–1. TS 31)

3: 10 (10–18) *ιδειν ημερας* with most MSS against *2, 1* C *et al.*

3: 10 (25) om. *αυτου* with 𝔓[72] A B C, against + *αυτου* ℵ and most MSS

3: 10 (33) cf. (25) above. Omit *αυτου* with 𝔓[72] A B C; *αυτου* Byz. Scribes often omit what were considered as unnecessary pronouns especially when post-positional

Against ECM

1 Peter 2: 21 (10–12) *οτι* with A *pauci* against *οτι και* 𝔓[72] ℵ B C (possibly original as *και* could have been accidentally omitted through hom)

2: 21 (16–22). There are some 15 *v.ll.* here. 𝔓[81] with ℵ reads *απεθανεν υπερ υμων* which may possibly be original, given the ugliness of the combination preceding *υμιν*. Theologically *υμων* may have seemed too limiting and that pronoun needed changing. Also *επαθεν* was altered deliberately or misread as *απεθανεν* in some witnesses. (Wachtel pp. 246–9. TS 29)

3: 1 (4) om. *αι* with ℵ* A B 81 only, possibly because *γυναικες* was read as vocative.

3: 1 (18–24) *ει τινες απειθουσιν* with B; *και ει τινες απειθουσιν* 𝔓[72] ℵ A, dotted in *ECM*; *ει και, 3.4* C accepted as the alternative dotted reading in *ECM*

3: 7 (2) om. *οι* with B; + *οι cett.*

3: 7 (30) om. *και* with 049 1881 only; + *και cett.*

3: 7 (44–8) *εγκοπτεσθαι τας προσευχας* with B; *εκκοπτεσθαι τας προσευχας* 𝔓[72] C *et al.*; *εγκοπτεσθαι τας προσευχας* A Byz

𝔓[100]

A confident informal hand. No accents; frequent diaeresis; *nomen sacrum* for *κυριος bis*; itacisms. Some careless errors. Page numbers 6 and 7 survive, indicating either that this manuscript was a single codex of James or the beginning of a book containing James and other Catholic Epistles.

With ECM

James 3: 14 (5) om. αρα with ℵ B C Byz against + αρα A P

3: 14 (18–20) τη καρδια with A B C Byz; ℵ *pc* read plural

3: 16 (13) om. και (after εκει) with B C, against + και ℵ A *pauci*

3: 17 (33) Spacing suggests om. εργων, against + εργων C

4: 2 (29) om. και before ουκ εχετε² with A B, against + και ℵ

4: 3 (2) αιτειτε¹ with ℵ A B, against αιτειτε δε P Ψ *pauci*

4: 4 (2) μοιχαλιδες i.e. om. μοιχοι και with ℵ* A B; + μοιχοι και ℵᶜ Byz. Possibly the (original) longer text was accidentally shortened because of hom. (Wachtel pp. 232–3. TS 18)

4: 9 (22) μετατραπητω with B P; μεταστραφετω ℵ A Byz

4: 11 (16) η κρινων with ℵ A B *et al.* against και κρινων Byz. (Wachtel p. 234. TS 20)

4: 13 (28) ποιησομεν with B P against ποιησωμεν ℵ A Ψ Byz

Against ECM

James 3: 17 (37) και (before ανυποκριτος) with K L against ℵ A B (om. και)

4: 3 (14) αιτειτε² with 69 631 (*pace* Hübner *OP*[43] LXV p. 24) and therefore a reading unique in majuscule manuscripts; all other manuscripts read αιτεισθε

4: 10 (5–6) του κυριου with Byz; κυριου ℵ *A B* 018 = *ECM*; του θεου 945 999 1241

4: 12 (6) om. ο with 𝔓⁷⁴ B P *pauci* against ο *cett.* dotted

4: 14 (15) γαρ¹ with 𝔓⁷⁴ A maj., but Hübner points out that, with the omission by 𝔓¹⁰⁰ of η before ζωη, its sequence [ποια]γαρ ζωη is unique among Greek witnesses. *ECM* is with ℵ B in reading ποια η but ποια γαρ η is given as the dotted alternative

𝔓¹²⁵

A good hand; no ligatures. Some misspellings. *Nomina sacra* attested. Earliest evidence of Petrine letters in Oxyrhynchus (otherwise the earliest = 0206)

[43] The editor, R. Hübner, may be correct (*OP* LXV p. 25) that 𝔓¹⁰⁰ did not follow ℵ in omitting ατμις γαρ εστε at 4: 14, but in view of other variants e.g. by B or by 33, shown in NA, his reconstruction of the missing words in James 4: 14 in l. 17 is not necessarily correct.

With ECM

1 Peter 1: 23 (26)–4 (2) *μενοντος διοτι* ℵ A B C; *μενοντος οτι* 𝔓72; *μενοντος διο* Ψ 1852. No addition after *μενοντες* of *εις τον αιωνα* K L P maj. or *εις τους αιωνας* 104 459 1838 1842 only (Wachtel pp. 245–6. TS 28)

1: 24 (8) *ως*¹ with 𝔓72 B C maj.; *ωσει* ℵ*; om. ℵc A Ψ

1: 24 (36) No addition after *ανθος*² (with 𝔓72 A B); *v.ll. ανθος αυτου* C K L P maj.; *ανθος αυτης* 614 621 2412 only

1: 25 (30–4) *ευαγγελισθεν εις υμας* is supported by most manuscripts; *2–3, 1* 𝔓72 (see above under 𝔓72)

2: 2 (11) There is no *και* before *αδολον* with 𝔓72 ℵ B C Byz; *v.l.* + *και* 33 614 630 *et al.*

2: 2 (26–8) *εις σωτηριαν* with 𝔓72 ℵ A B C; om. 'maj.', according to NA (*ECM* has L 049 and thirty-three other MSS).

2: 4 (12) Read *υπο*, not *απο* (read by C and a few others) or *υπερ* 5 623.

Against ECM

1 Peter 2: 1 (28) *συνκαταλαλια*, a unique reading; most manuscripts have *πασας καταλαλιας*. ℵ* reads *πασαν καταλαλιαν*; L has *πασης καταλαλιας* (a *Fehler* according to *ECM*) and A 1735 1881 read *καταλαλιας*

2: 3 (8) XC as a *nomen sacrum* with 𝔓72 K L 049 against *χρηστος* ℵ A B C

2: 8 (16) *προσκοψουσιν* with 1490*T*[44] only. Most manuscripts have *προσκοπτουσιν*

2: 9 (46–50) *θαυμαστον φως* i.e. om. *αυτου* with 𝔓72; *v.l. θαυμαστον αυτου φως* most manuscripts; *1, 3, 2* 1067

2: 12 (14) Most manuscripts have *εχοντες* before *καλην*; 𝔓125 om. (Note: B's reading is said to be an error in *ECM*.)

A new Oxyrhynchus text is to come: a third–fourth-century fragment containing James 3: 14–15; 3: 18–4: 1 edited by Michael Theophilos, awaiting publication in *OP*. Advance information suggests that at James 3: 14 (30) the fragment reads *καταψευδεσθε* with 1840 (a sixteenth-century Byzantine manuscript) against *ψευδεσθε cett.* Note that this reading follows on from *κατακαυχασθε v.l. καυχασθε pler.* including 1840(!).

[44] 1490Z has *προσκοπτουσιν*. Chapa has 1409, but that is probably a typographical slip. That cursive is cited for a different reading in *ECM*.

0206

Round uncial writing; no clear punctuation; pagination (229, added by a later hand) indicates that the original volume was large.

With ECM

1 Peter 5: 6 (20–2) *υμας υψωση* with 𝔓72 א B Byz; against *2, 1* 206 218 *et al.* or *υμας υψωσει* 6 33 81 *pauci*

5: 6 (27) om. *επισκοπης* with 𝔓72 א B Byz; + *επισκοπης* A P 0142 *et al.*

5: 7 (22) *περι* with most MSS; *υπερ* 1 18 33 *et al.*

5: 8 (5) om. *οτι* with א* A B ; against + *οτι* 𝔓72 א[c]

5: 8 (14–20) *ωρυομενος περιπατει* with 𝔓72 א A B against *ωρυομενος περιερχεται* read by 18 35 206 *et al.*

5: 10 (28–30) *εν χριστω* with א against *εν χριστω ιησου* 𝔓72 A Byz (dotted in *ECM*)

Against ECM

1 Peter 5: 8 (24–26) *καταπειν* unique spelling (plus omission of *τινα* supported by B)

5: 9 (32) *επιτελεισθε* with א A B* against *-αι* Byz

5: 10 (16) *ημας* with 330 398 *pauci* against *υμας* 𝔓72 א A B Byz

5: 10 (38–44) *καταρτισει στηριξει σθενωσει* with A B, against + *θεμελιωσει* (*-αι*) *cett.*

5: 11 (13) + *των αιωνων* with א A Byz; om. *των αιωνων* dotted in *ECM*

CONCLUSIONS

What do the early papyri add to our understanding of the textual heritage of the Catholic Epistles other than their early dates? I submit that the answer is 'But little', and even to emphasize their early dates is deceptive. The age of a manuscript is of no significance when assessing textual variation, unless we know how many stages there were between the autograph and that copy and also what changes were made at each of the intervening stages. No one has such information. Instead, when discussing the variants extracted from the *TuT* or *ECM,* we need to ask which is likely to be the reading that gave rise to the alternative(s) and why. The age, number, and alleged pre-eminence of the manuscript should not be determinative. What matter are an awareness of those readings that are compatible with our author's style, language, or

theology, the reading that fits best into first-century Koine Greek and a recognition of how accidental change may have occasioned certain variants. Papyri may or may not support the reading deemed earliest, and their attestation deserves to be taken no more seriously than that in any other manuscript witness.

By analysing the manuscripts with which the papyri above associate, there is a mixed picture. Obviously where the manuscript has a unique (singular) reading (as happens regularly with $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$) it goes against all other manuscripts, including the earliest majuscules. Often we note that each manuscript has to be assessed separately from its peers. Some papyri certainly are seen above to ally themselves with ℵ B but no clearly consistent pattern emerges even in those places where the bulk of the tradition is fragmented over a variant. One may note that $\mathfrak{P}^{23}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{81}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{125}$ are relatively close to ℵ B, $\mathfrak{P}^{20}$ less so, and $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ is even less close. $\mathfrak{P}^{100}$ often seems to read against ℵ but no one witness here can be portrayed as an obvious ancestor of any of the great third–fourth-century codices.

In conclusion, we need to ask why it is that the papyri are privileged by most textual critics and editors of an *apparatus criticus*. Who first promoted their supremely great authority? Shakespeare may wisely have remarked that some men are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them (*Twelfth Night,* 2. 5), but few—if any—papyri look as if they were born great: most of our papyri, even those with extensive portions such as $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ or $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ in the Chester Beatty collection or $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ in the Bodmer Library or $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ now in the Vatican, look like humble productions, simple and practical—not the remnants of *de luxe* editions—not that a manuscript's appearance is of relevance in the assessment of its text. Some papyri have obviously achieved their greatness just because of their age, and thereby allowing an insight into a tantalizing period in the life of the text preceding the time of the great uncials and often problematizing the nature of their text. They are like elder statesmen basking in their own longevity, revered as custodians of an otherwise lost link to the distant past. But most papyri have had their greatness thrust upon them, whatever the dates allocated to them by palaeographers (and a significant number of papyri are indeed later than the fifth century), partly because they are all of recent discovery, thus making their arrival on a scholar's radar relatively newsworthy, partly because most are published soon after they are unearthed so gaining for themselves a popularity due to their being quickly in the public domain, and partly because the gullible believe that there is an unwarranted magic associated with their having been written on papyrus.

12

The Early Text of Revelation

Tobias Nicklas

More than any other book of today's New Testament canon, the book of Revelation makes an immense claim for authority. In its first lines the text describes itself as a 'prophecy' finding its roots in God's word itself (Rev. 1: 1–3), while shortly before its end the text offers a 'canon formula' (or better a *Textsicherungsformel*) comparable to the ones we find in the Torah (Rev. 22: 18–19).[1] Nevertheless, Revelation's route into the canon of the New Testament was extremely problematic. While it seems to have had an important status for second- and third-century Western writers like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, Hippolytus, and others, many Eastern fathers did not accept it as part of their canon. This could be partly due to Dionysios of Alexandria's (*c.*190–264/5 CE) assessment of the text as not coming from the same author as the Fourth Gospel (see Eusebius, *H.E.* 7.24–5). Even if Dionysios himself did not totally reject the book, many authors like, for example, the Cappadocian Fathers, did not quote it.[2] So it is no surprise that Revelation did not find its way into the canon of the Syriac *Peshitto* and that the first full Greek commentary on Revelation came from the sixth-century writer Oecumenios, who was later followed by Andrew of Caesarea (563–637) and others.[3]

These circumstances seem to have been at least one reason for the fact that—compared to other New Testament writings—we have only very few extant traces of an 'early text' of the book of Revelation.

[1] For more information regarding this topic see T. Nicklas, '"The Words of the Prophecy of this Book": Playing with Scriptural Authority in the Book of Revelation', in M. Popović, ed., *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 309–26.

[2] For more information on the (ancient) reception history of the book see G. Kretschmar, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1985), and J. Kovacs and C. Rowland, *Revelation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).

[3] For more information on Andrew's commentary see E. Scarvelis Constantinou, *Andrew of Caesarea and the Apocalypse in the Ancient Church of the East* (2 vols. Ph.D. Université Laval, Quebec, 2008).

THE OVERALL TEXTUAL SITUATION[4]

Among the more than 300 manuscripts that contain Revelation[5] only four can with some probability be dated earlier than (or at least around) the year 300 CE. None of these ($\mathfrak{P}^{18}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{47}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{98}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{115}$) contains the whole text of Revelation: $\mathfrak{P}^{18}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{98}$ have only a few words or sentences.

The only fourth-century manuscript containing the full text of Revelation is Codex Sinaiticus (א). Codex Vaticanus (B) does not include it.[6] Other fourth-century manuscripts are $\mathfrak{P}^{24}$, 0169, and 0207, all of them fragmentary: Codex Alexandrinus (A), perhaps the most important witness of a full text of Revelation, originates from the fifth century.

While the number of papyri containing a text of Revelation—at the moment seven papyri are known—accords with that of other New Testament writings, it is only poorly represented in uncial manuscripts. According to J. K. Elliott's overview, 'only eleven uncials contain this book',[7] five of them from the eighth century or later.

Many even later witnesses contain Revelation together with other, often non-canonical writings. Quite often a commentary was added—mainly the one by Andrew of Caesarea. In other manuscripts (e.g. 180, 181, 209, 429, 1140, 1857) the text of Revelation is written by a different hand than other New Testament writings. Moreover, minuscule 1668 (eleventh century) originally did not contain Revelation: a printed paper copy of the book was added sometime during the sixteenth century.[8] These could be indications that many earlier circles regarded Revelation as permissible to read, like for example the *Shepherd of Hermas*,[9] but not always as part of scripture. And even where it was recognized as part of the canon, Revelation seemingly was seen as something very special.

[4] For the following overview compare the descriptions by J. Hernández, Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 2–5, J. Delobel, 'Le Texte de l'Apocalypse: Problèmes de méthode', in J. Lambrecht (ed.), *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1980), 151–66, and J. K. Elliott, 'The Distinctiveness of the Greek Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation', *JTS* 48 (1997): 116–24.

[5] In 1997 Elliott, 'Distinctiveness', gave the number 303, but he could not have known about the finding of $\mathfrak{P}^{115}$ at that stage.

[6] This, however, is due to the fragmentary nature of the codex, not to reasons of canon development.

[7] Elliott, 'Distinctiveness', 117.

[8] Ibid. 118. A different case is Ms. 94 where the section containing the book of Revelation, a 12th–cent. parchment, is bound together with a 13th–cent. paper manuscript of Acts/Catholic Epistles and Pauline writings.

[9] For more information on the textual history of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, see M. Choat and R. Yuen-Collingridge, 'The Egyptian Hermas: The Shepherd in Egypt before Constantine', in T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, eds., *Early Christian Manuscripts* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 191–211.

No portions of Revelation can be found in extant Greek lectionaries. This is surely another indication of the book's disputed status, but also leads to additional problems. Juan Hernández writes: '[S]ince lectionaries played a critical role in stabilizing the Byzantine text elsewhere in the NT, the lack of a lectionary results in a less homogenous Byzantine text for the book of Revelation.'[10]

All of these circumstances have long made research into the textual history of the book of Revelation an extremely complex task.

J. SCHMID'S ASSESSMENT OF THE TEXTUAL HISTORY

As long as a 'comprehensive history of the text of Revelation and the patristic commentaries waits to be written'[11] our understanding of the overall development of the text depends on Josef Schmid's magisterial *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*.[12] This is not the place to give a full critical review of Schmid's work,[13] but a few sentences about Schmid's thoughts seem to be important for understanding the following evaluation of the extant witnesses of an early text of Revelation. Schmid distinguishes between four different text types of Revelation. According to him, two of them clearly result from recensional activities.

Andrew of Caesarea's text offers a great number of particular readings (*Sonderlesarten*), most of them clearly secondary. According to Schmid, this text type must be considered a recension, done by a single person who corrected the whole of the text chapter by chapter, but whose corrections are not consistent.[14] That does not, however, mean that Andrew's text is without any importance for a reconstruction of the original text; to the contrary, it contains at least some very old readings.[15]

With 290 examples the *Koine-text* offers even more particular readings than Andrew. Like the Andrew-text, the Koine type does not show a clear

[10] Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 3–4.

[11] Elliott, 'Distinctiveness', 122.

[12] J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes* (3 vols. Munich: Zink, 1955–6). There are, of course, other, older important studies. Perhaps the most important one is H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (2 vols. London: B. Quaritch, 1929).

[13] For critical evaluations of Schmid's work see e.g. J. N. Birdsall, 'The Text of the Revelation of St. John: A Review of its Materials and Problems with Special Reference to the Work of Josef Schmid', *EvQ* 33 (1961): 228–37, and G. D. Kilpatrick, 'Professor J. Schmid on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse', *VC* 13 (1959): 1–13. A full overview of Schmid's work is given by J. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 23–8.

[14] See Schmid, *Studien*, ii. 53.

[15] For Andrew of Caesarea's text, ibid. 44–53.

consistency in its attempts to improve the sometimes problematic Greek of the apocalypse.[16] Moreover, it is not simply a pure derivation of the older text types represented by A C Oecumenius and 𝔓⁴⁷ א, but preserves the original text at a number of places.[17] While Schmid makes clear that Andrew and Koine must be seen as distinct text types, a number of secondary readings shared by both make clear that there must be a connection between them—the very complicated correlation of findings does not allow too simple explanations of the issue.

Even the 'old' text of Revelation can be subdivided in two text-types. One of them is represented by the group A C and Oecumenius.[18] However, C is lacunous and offers only two-thirds of the text of Revelation, while Oecumenius' commentary does not always allow a reconstruction of its *Vorlage*. This is the reason why more than once A must be considered the only representative of this text type. While A C Oecumenius as a whole surpasses the value of all other text types, at several passages C shows more (secondary) derivations from the A C Oecumenius text than A, which makes A the most valuable witness of this text type.

Finally, the second 'old' text type of Revelation is represented by 𝔓⁴⁷, א (and Origen). Schmid shows that, while both show a lot of secondary corrections against A C, many of the textual corrections of Andrew's text and the Koine are not yet to be found in 𝔓⁴⁷ and Sinaiticus, whose text is very close to Origen's.[19] Compared to א, which is written by a rather careless hand and offers a lot of singular readings,[20] the fragmentary 𝔓⁴⁷ is not only the older manuscript (see below) but is written more carefully than א.[21] On the whole, the finding of 𝔓⁴⁷ did not only allow the readings of א to be checked, but it established 𝔓⁴⁷ א as its own text type, whose traces can be found in later minuscules (fos. 1006; 2344, partly 1678, 1611, 1854) and the Coptic translations. However, although 𝔓⁴⁷ and א are clearly older than A and C, they show a greater distance from the original text than A C.

Even if Schmid regards A C as the most reliable of his four text types, each of them at least in some cases preserves the original reading where all the others are derivative.[22] While according to Schmid, *all* these text types have

16 Ibid. 63, writes: 'Dabei wird sich herausstellen, dass die Schöpfer der beiden Rezensionen An [= Andrew; TN] und K [= Koine; TN] sich auf von Fall zu Fall wechselnde Änderungen der hauptsächlichsten sprachlichen Anstöße und auf Verdeutlichungen des Textes beschränkten.'

17 See the list of examples, ibid. 84.

18 Ibid. 85–109.

19 Ibid. 110, however, writes: 'Die Zahl der Verse, in denen sich Origenes neben S [= Sinaiticus; TN] stellen läßt, ist nicht sehr groß. Sie ist lediglich genügend, um die nahe Verwandtschaft zwischen seinem Text und dem von S erkennen zu lassen.'

20 For a closer analysis of these singular readings cf. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*.

21 See also J. Schmid, 'Der Apokalypsetext des Chester Beatty 𝔓⁴⁷', *ByzNeugr.Jb* 11 (1934): 81–108.

22 See Schmid, *Studien*, ii. 150.

their roots in times not later than the fourth century,[23] there has never been only *one* ecclestiastically approved text-type.[24]

What can be done with this textual situation? Reading Schmid's magisterial volume leaves one with a somewhat ambivalent impression—on the one hand Schmid offers an incredible amount of material, but on the other hand he more or less concentrates on the Greek strand of tradition. His idea of four text types of the apocalypse is already quite complicated, but Schmid is well-aware that he has to leave a lot of questions open regarding the obvious connections between the four types. That means, of course, that a lot of work is still left to be done.

THE USE OF REVELATION BY SECOND- AND FOURTH-CENTURY GREEK CHRISTIAN AUTHORS

Where we have no (or only few) manuscripts of a certain text the importance of quotations by early Christian authors increases. In the case of the apocalypse, the text's use by ancient authors is not only crucial for our understanding of its canonization, but also for the history of its text; we have already seen the impact of Oecumenius, Andrew of Caesarea, and Origen for J. Schmid's reconstruction of textual history. Of course, modern textual critics are well-aware of the many methodological problems caused by the reconstruction of a text with the help of ancient authors' quotations: we never know whether an ancient author quoted from a written *Vorlage* or just by memory, and we always have to decide whether he altered a given text consciously so that it better fit his current argument. And of course, just as with the New Testament, we never have the original text of any given ancient author, but always depend on (more or less) critical editions.[25]

The question of the earliest reception of Revelation is an extremely difficult one. While, for example, an early author like Justin Martyr (*c*.100–65) shows a clear knowledge of the apocalypse in his discussion of the eschatological 'Millenium of Peace' (see his *Dial.* 81.4) and seems to allude to the apocalypse at some other passages, he does not actually quote the text. The situation is

[23] Ibid. 149–50: 'Am Anfang der Textgeschichte steht . . . ein mit geringer Pietät behandelter und darum wenig einheitlicher Text. Dieser bildete in seinen verschiedenen Formen die Grundlage, auf der die späteren Rezensionen, deren älteste der "neutrale" Text ist [= AC; TN], entstanden. . . . Ein nicht unwichtiges Ergebnis . . . ist endlich der Nachweis des hohen Alters sämtlicher hier besprochener Textformen.'

[24] See Elliott, 'Distinctiveness', 120.

[25] For more information see the relevant articles in: B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).

even more difficult with other writers; in many cases we cannot be absolutely sure whether a motif used in a second- or third-century writing finds its roots in the reception of Revelation or in a common 'apocalyptic' worldview.[26]

The earliest extant quotation of a passage of Revelation comes from the *Epistle of Vienne and Lyons* relating to the persecutions of Christians in Gaul (probably) during the year 177,[27] a text transmitted in the fifth book of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (*H.E.*).

Introduced by the formula 'that Scripture may be fulfilled' (*ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ*), the *Epistle* quotes Revelation 22: 11 in the following form:[28]

ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι
καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι

This text shows, of course, a lot of differences to what we find in NA's edition of Rev. 22: 11:

(1) *ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀνομησάτω ἔτι*
(2) *καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω ἔτι*
(3) *καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι*
(4) *καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι.*

The question as to whether the author of the *Epistle* used Revelation in a very free manner or depended on a *Vorlage* differing from what we find in our critical editions is difficult. The answer seems to be somewhere in between. First, the *Epistle's* quotation is much shorter than NA's; the absence of elements (2) and (4) of the critical text could be partly due to the *Epistle's* interest in contrasting the martyrs and their persecutors. However, in its minus of (2) the *Epistle* parallels A and some later minuscules (2030, 2050, 2062^{txt} *pc*). Do we have an early representation of an A-Text here? I would hesitate to answer, because none of the other variants here can be connected to A. The variant *ἄνομος* for *ἀδικῶν* seems to be a singular reading— however, one which seems to fit the structure of Rev. 22: 11 much better than *ἀδικῶν*—

[26] See the partly controversial views of T. Nicklas, 'Probleme der Apokalypserezeption im 2. Jahrhundert: Eine Diskussion mit Charles Hill', in J. Verheyden et al., *Ancient Christian Interpretations of 'Violent Texts' in the Apocalypse* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011) 28–45; id., 'Rezeption und Nicht-Rezeption der Offenbarung des Johannes durch antike christliche Apokalypsen, in R. Klotz and C. Winterer, eds., *Tot Sacramenta quot verba* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2012) and the magisterial work of C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: OUP, 2004) who is, however, much more optimistic about finding traces of the use of the Apocalypse than myself.

[27] For a critical evaluation of this text's reception of the Book of Revelation see T. Baumeister, 'Der Brief an die Gemeinden von Vienne und Lyon und die Offenbarung des Johannes', in F. W. Horn and M. Wolter, eds., *Studien zur Johannesoffenbarung und ihrer Auslegung* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2005), 339–55. A somewhat later date of the text has been suggested by T. D. Barnes, 'Pre-Decian *Acta Martyrum*', *JTS* 19 (1968): 509–31.

[28] For a close analysis of the quotation see Baumeister, 'Brief', 347–50.

while δικαιωθήτω finds a parallel in 2020, certain Latin witnesses, and the Bohairic translation. So if any (very cautious) conclusion is allowed, the *Epistle of Vienne and Lyons* seems to quote a very early free text of Rev. 22: 11 in a free manner.

Other authors have similar problems: although the corpus of writings of Clement of Alexandria shows a clear knowledge of Revelation, according to Schmid,[29] the entire corpus contains only two quotations, one of them giving parts of Rev. 6: 9, 11 (GCS 12.222.7–9):

καὶ ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις φησιν

εἶδον τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μεμαρτυρηκότῶν ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.

καὶ ἐδόθη ἑκάστῳ στολὴ λευκή...

This is, of course, such a free quotation that one can only guess what Clement's text of Revelation really looked like. I would even be cautious—*pace* Schmid[30]—to interpret this form of the text as a (probable) witness for a text (1) not reading *των ανθρωπων* before *εσφαγμενον* (as e.g. א does) and (2) without the *του αρνιου* after *μαρτυριαν* (as e.g. Koine does). So, even if we have a very ancient quotation here, its text-critical value is extremely limited.

Other early authors, like Irenaeus of Lyons (*c*.140–*c*.202), face different challenges: even if Irenaeus' writings contain quite a number of quotations from Revelation, long passages are only extant in Latin and Armenian versions. What is especially interesting with Irenaeus, however, is that at one place he considers a textual variant in his manuscripts of Revelation and thereby offers a certain insight into his own guiding principles of textual criticism. In his *Adversus haereses* 5.30.1 he discusses the question whether the number of the beast according to Rev. 13: 18 originally was 666 or 616.[31] He votes for '666' as the original reading which, as he says, can be found in all 'reliable and old manuscripts' (*in omnibus antiquis et probatissimis et veteribus scripturis*) and is witnessed even by persons who knew John, the author of the apocalypse, personally (*facie ad faciem*). Moreover, Irenaeus explains the number 616 as a scribal error and tries to give some intrinsic reasons for the value of the reading '666'. Even if we cannot accept every aspect of his argument, this passage is interesting for several reasons. On the one hand Irenaeus shows a clear awareness of the diversity of texts of Revelation and attributes this to a certain carelessness of scribes. On the other hand he is interested in finding the original text within this diversity and uses clear criteria in reconstructing it.

[29] Schmid, *Studien*, ii. 152.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Texts of Irenaeus of Lyons according to N. Brox, ed., *Irenäus von Lyon: Adversus Haereses* (Freiburg: Herder, 1996–2001).

Until today we are still dependent on J. Schmid's list of quotations in the works of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus of Rome, Eusebius of Caesarea, Methodius of Olympos, and Irenaeus of Lyons.[32] As stated above, Origen's many quotations of Revelation regularly go with the texts of 𝔓47 and ℵ and help to establish this important text type; in most cases Origen's singular readings should be attributed to quotation from memory. Most of Hippolytus' quotations can be found in his tractate *On Christ and Antichrist*, some of them in his *Commentary on Daniel*. What makes Hippolytus perhaps most interesting among the early fathers is the fact that he quotes longer passages of Revelation, once even two full chapters (chs. 17–18 in *On Christ and Antichrist*). However, Schmid's assessment of Hippolytus' text is not very helpful. In a number of places Hippolytus shows similarities to 𝔓47 ℵ; on the whole, however, Schmid states that his text affirms the text of the old uncial manuscripts[33]—whatever this may mean for the place of Hippolytus' text in the overall textual history of Revelation. Schmid's assessment of Methodios of Olympos is exactly the same.[34] Eusebius, finally, is interesting because many of his quotations go back to earlier sources, which he quotes in his *Ecclesiastical History*, such as the above-mentioned *Epistle of Vienne and Lyons* or Dionysios of Alexandria.

(FRAGMENTARY) MANUSCRIPTS OF REVELATION BEFORE THE FOURTH CENTURY[35]

𝔓98 (= P.IFAO II 31)[36]

Perhaps the oldest extant material witness of a text of Revelation is P.IFAO II 31, listed as 𝔓98 in Gregory-Aland's list. While its recto contains remains of an otherwise unknown text, its verso (size: 7 × 13cm) contains the beginnings of nineteen lines of a (badly preserved) text of Rev. 1: 13–20. Traces of two

[32] Additionally, Old Latin witnesses of the text of the Apocalypse are given in R. Gryson, ed., *Apocalypsis Johannis* (Freiburg: Herder, 2003).

[33] Schmid, *Studien*, ii. 164: 'Im ganzen bestätigt der Text des Hippolyt den der alten Uncialen.'

[34] Ibid. 167.

[35] There are currently two papyri from times later than the 4th century which can be mentioned in a footnote: (1) 𝔓43 (= P.London inv. 2241) was edited by W. E. Crum and H. I. Bell, *Coptica III: Wadi Sarga* (Copenhagen, 1922), 43–51. It contains Rev. 2: 12–13; 15: 8, and 16: 1–2, and dates from the 7th or even 8th cent. (2) 𝔓85 (= P.Strasbourg Gr. 1028), ed. J. Schwartz, 'Papyrus et tradition manuscrite', *ZPE 4* (1969): 175–182, esp. 178 and 181–2. The fragment contains portions of Rev. 9: 19–10: 1 and 10: 5–9 and should be dated to the 5th cent.

[36] See D. Hagedorn, 'P.IFAO II 31: Johannesapokalypse 1,13–20', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 92 (1992): 243–7; table IX.

additional lines at the end of the fragment can no longer be read. Hagedorn describes the handwriting as 'not particularly regular' and 'no book-hand in the narrower sense of the word', but also no 'commercial hand, because it avoids any really cursive elements'.[37] Hagedorn is quite hesitant in giving an exact date for such a short papyrus—he regards the second century CE as plausible, but does not want to exclude a date at the beginning of the third century.[38]

Because the fragment does not give a continuous text of Rev. 1: 13–20 it is quite difficult to reconstruct its textual variants with any certainty.

If we group them according to Schmid's pattern, the following result emerges:[39]

(1) Against both א and A C, 𝔓98 probably read *χρυσῆν* instead of *χρυσᾶν* in Rev. 1: 13.

(2) In Rev. 1: 14 𝔓98 offers the singular reading *καὶ ἡ κε[φαλή* instead of *ἡ δὲ κεφαλή*.

(3) The reading *ἀστέρες* (Rev. 1: 16, instead of *ἀστέρας*) goes with A (and 2021).[40]

(4) The reading *αὐ]τοῦ ὡς ἥλιος φ[αίνει* (Rev. 1: 16) seems to go against the א-variant starting with *φαίνει*. For the lack of the article before *ἥλιος* only much later parallels can be found (e.g. 241; eleventh century). Later, in Rev. 1: 17, 𝔓98 has the words *μὴ φοβοῦ*, which are lacking in א.

(5) Against the Koine text which has *τοῦ ᾅδου καὶ τοῦ θανάτου* at the end of Rev. 1: 18, 𝔓98 has *τοῦ ᾅδου* and goes on with *γράψον* from the beginning of 1: 19, which seems to be a witness of the reading *τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾅδου*.

(6) In Rev. 1: 19 𝔓98 reads *γενέσθαι* with א and C against *γίνεσθαι* in A.

What can be done with this? In his edition of the text Hagedorn does not offer a conclusion—and as far as I see, the evidence of 𝔓98 does not allow for a conclusion. This has certainly to do with the dimensions of our fragment, but perhaps it could also be due to the fact that our papyrus does not really fit into the overall picture Schmid is drawing. Is 𝔓98 offering us an example of an early 'mixed' text? We cannot be sure.

[37] German original from Hagedorn, 'P.IFAO', 243: 'Geschrieben ist der Text der Apokalypse in einer nicht sonderlich regelmäßigen Schrift, die man nicht als eine Buchschrift im engeren Sinne bezeichnen möchte, wenngleich auch nicht von einer Geschäftsschrift gesprochen werden kann, da alle wirklich kursiven Elemente vermieden sind.'

[38] Cf. ibid. 246.

[39] For a first discussion of the variants, ibid. 246–7. I do not mention possible readings due to assumptions about lost passages of the text.

[40] This means that, due to grammatical reasons, the rest of Rev. 1: 16 probably followed the A-reading as well.

𝔓47 (= P.Chester Beatty 3)[41]

P. Chester Beatty 3 is certainly by far the most important early witness of Revelation on papyrus. The fragment consists of ten leaves of a papyrus codex which originally contained a continuous text of the whole of Revelation. What is extant now is an almost complete text of Rev. 9: 10–17: 2, the only important gaps being at the upper margins of the pages where between one and six lines are lost. The text is written in one column measuring approximately 10 × 20cm, the original size of the leaves can be estimated as *c*.14 × 24cm. F. G. Kenyon describes the writing of the codex as 'rather rough in character, thick in formation, and with no pretensions in calligraphy. The letters are upright and of medium size, and simple and unexaggerated in style. They are certainly more Roman than Byzantine in character.... There is nothing in the hand to suggest a later date than the third century, but it is likely to be late in the century.'[42] Kenyon's comparison with the text of 𝔓47 shows 182 agreements and 196 disagreements with א, 167 agreements and 209 disagreements with A, and 157 agreements and 171 disagreements with C; additionally, he finds eighty singular readings and twenty-seven readings he calls 'sub-singular' because they are supported only by one or very few later minuscules.[43] All these data, of course, formed only a rough basis for later research.[44]

The text's singular readings were the subject of a closer examination by James R. Royse[45] who found only seventy-six singular readings: only fifty-three of them could be regarded as textually significant, the others being orthographic errors or nonsense readings. According to Royse, none of the remaining singular readings shows any sign of a certain theological tendency. What can be detected, however, is the scribe's carelessness regarding orthography. This obviously does not exclude a certain (non-consistent) interest in grammar and style and a tendency to shorten his (presumed) *Vorlage*.[46]

Of course, many authors were mainly interested in the impact of 𝔓47 for the textual history of Revelation. R. V. G. Tasker examined how 𝔓47 treats grammatical features like the use of the article, prepositions, numbers, etc. and found 'signs of correction though not to the same extent as [in] the *textus*

[41] Information according to the edn. by F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, iii (London: Walker, 1934). See also M.-J. Lagrange, 'Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Épitres de S. Paul et l'Apocalypse', *RB* 43 (1934): 481–93, esp. 488–92, and R. V. G. Tasker, 'The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Apocalypse of John', *JTS* 50 (1949): 60–8.

[42] Kenyon, *Chester Beatty*, iii, p. xii.

[43] Cf. ibid. See also Lagrange, 'Chester Beatty', 488.

[44] See e.g. the criticism by Tasker, 'Chester Beatty', 61.

[45] Cf. J. R. Royse's dissertation *Scribal Habits in Early New Testament Papyri* (Th.Diss. Graduate Theological Union, 1981). It is now available as *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2008).

[46] For more details see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 359–98.

receptus',[47] and showed affinities between Origen's text of Revelation and 𝔓47.[48] His further ideas about 𝔓47 reflecting 'an early revision of the original text... similar to that reflected in the text used by Origen, and less thorough than [the *textus receptus*]',[49] and also about 𝔓47's close relation to א, form an important step toward J. Schmid, who saw 𝔓47 as a key witness of its own old text type closely related to א and Origen.[50]

𝔓18 (= P.Oxy. VIII 1079)

P.Oxy. VIII 1079, the verso of P.Oxy VIII 1075, a fragment of a scroll containing the conclusion of the book of Exodus on its recto (15.1 × 9.8cm), offers fragments of Rev. 1: 4–7. The text of Revelation is written in the contrary direction to the text of the recto, a clear sign of a later reuse of the Exodus scroll. According to A. S. Hunt, the editor, 'the script is a clear, medium-sized cursive, upright and heavily formed, which should perhaps be attributed to the fourth rather than to the third century, though the latter is not at all impossible'.[51] Apart from the singular reading *τῷ θεῷ* instead of *τοῦ θεοῦ* in Rev. 1: 6 the text goes with A C, while it does not show any of the particular readings of the Koine or of Andrew's text type.[52] This should, however, not lead to far-reaching conclusions—we should not forget that this fragment contains only seventeen (quite short) lines of text. The fact that it was written on the verso of a scroll, which originally was designed for the book of Exodus, seems to be even more interesting than its textual features.

𝔓115 (= P.Oxy. LXVI 4499)

P.Oxy. LXVI 4499 is surely one of the most important witnesses of an early text of the book of Revelation. This fragment, edited by J. Chapa in 1999,[53] consists of the remains of nine leaves of a codex (original size: approximately 14.5 × 22cm/written area 12.5 × 18.5cm) which on palaeographical grounds can be dated to the late third or early fourth century CE. The extant fragments contain Rev. 2: 1–3, 13–15, 27–9; 3: 10–12; 5: 8–9; 6: 4–6; and parts of 8: 3–15: 7. One year after Chapa's first edition, the text of 𝔓115 became the subject of a detailed analysis by D. Parker who interprets it as a very early witness of an A C text type.[54]

[47] Tasker, 'Chester Beatty Papyrus', 64. [48] Cf. ibid. 66–7. [49] Ibid. 67.
[50] See above.
[51] A. S. Hunt, 1079, in *P.Oxy* VIII, 13–14, here 13.
[52] See also Schmid, *Studien*, ii. 171.
[53] J. Chapa, '4499,' in *P.Oxy*. LXVI, 10–37.
[54] See D. Parker, 'A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Revelation', *NTS* 46 (2000): 159–74.

SOME LATER WITNESSES

Because space permits a broader description of the main uncials containing a text of the Apocalypse,[55] it may be interesting to have a somewhat closer look at some lesser known manuscripts.

𝔓24 (= P.Oxy. X 1230)[56]

P.Oxy. X 1230 is a tiny fragment (4.1 × 7cm) of a leaf of a papyrus codex containing remains of less than fifty words from Rev. 5: 5–8 and 6: 5–8. According to its editors, Grenfell and Hunt, the text is 'written in a medium-sized sloping informal hand, approximately to cursive, and dating probably to the earlier part of the fourth century'.[57] With its small size and its few words it is not possible to draw any safe conclusions about the manuscript's textual 'tendencies'—its few variants, however, allow at least the cautious conclusion that the extant portions mainly agree with the text of א.

0169 (= P.Oxy. VIII 1080)[58]

P.Oxy. VIII 1080 is a parchment leaf of a miniature codex measuring 9.5 × 7.8cm. Because its two pages are numbered 33 and 34, the original codex seems to have started with Revelation (and perhaps contained only this text). According to A. S. Hunt, 'the hand is a good-sized upright uncial, fairly regular and having a certain amount of ornamental finish; it may date from the fourth century'.[59] The fragment, listed as 0169 by Gregory-Aland, contains thirty lines of a text of Rev. 3: 19–4: 2 which shows some affinities to א, but also offers some readings connecting it to other text types. Thus the question arises whether assigning 0169 to a certain text type is not going a bit too far.[60] A definite answer to this question should probably be left open.

[55] For an overview and interpretation of singular readings in the Apocalypse text of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi see the important monograph of Hernández, Jr., *Scribal Habits*.

[56] The following information comes from the edn. by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, '1230', in *P.Oxy. X*, 18–19.

[57] Ibid. 18.

[58] For more information see A. S. Hunt, '1080', in *P.Oxy VIII*, 14–16.

[59] Ibid. 15.

[60] Schmid, *Studien*, ii. 172, writes: '0169 . . . ist am engsten mit S [= Sinaiticus; TN] verwandt'.

0207 (PSI X 1166)[61]

PSI X 1166 is an almost complete page of a two-column pergament codex measuring 15 × 19cm, edited by G. Vitelli in 1932. The fragment, which can be dated to the fourth century, contains a text of Rev. 9: 2–15 written in two columns. The extant text shows two cases of itacism; its few singular readings seem to be due to smaller scribal errors. The evaluation of its place in Schmid's pattern is quite difficult. While it seems to be clear that the extant text has very little relation to the 𝔓47 א-group, the fragment shows three important agreements with A, but also some of the corrections typical for the Koine-group. Additionally, Schmid lists two examples of stylistic changes and a minus of *και* in 9: 10, which are all in agreement with Andrew's text. PSI X 1166 certainly can be seen as supporting Schmid's idea that at least some of the corrections typical for his more 'secondary' text types can be traced back to at least the fourth century. The question as to which of Schmid's text types 0207 really belonged, however, can no longer be answered.[62]

CONCLUSION

As stated above, today's reconstructions of the textual history of the book of Revelation are still based on the still unsurpassed work of J. Schmid. Our short look at the textual situation, however, raises some (partly old) questions anew.

Even if Schmid's overall view of the textual history of Revelation withstands further critical research, some other questions arise. How can the relation between Schmid's two 'later' text types, Andrew and Koine, be assessed more clearly than was previously possible? While Andrew's text, according to Schmid, is an example of the recension of an (unknown) single hand (of course, much prior to Andrew of Caesarea),[63] the Koine text type shows a certain development from 'earlier' to 'later' Koine. Is there any chance today of describing this development more consistently than Schmid was able to do? How can the relationship between Andrew's text and the Koine be put in clearer terms than Schmid does?

[61] For the following information about the fragment see the edn. of G. Vitelli and G. Mercati, eds., *Papiri della Società Italiana*, x (Florence: Istituto papirologico, 1932), 112–20. For a textual evaluation of the fragment see J. Schmid, 'Der Apokalypsetext des Kodex 207 (Papiri della Società Italiana 1166)', *BZ* 23 (1935–6): 187–9.

[62] Schmid, 'Kodex 207', 189, writes: 'Die Kürze des Fragments erlaubt ein bestimmtes Urteil über die Textform der vollständigen Hs nicht mehr.' I am not sure whether this is due only to its relative shortness or also to the mixture of its readings.

[63] See Schmid, *Studien*, ii. 53.

Until now research on the textual history of Revelation mainly concentrated on Greek witnesses—Greek manuscripts and Greek authors. However, from early times Revelation played an important role in the Latin Church and was read and interpreted by many Latin fathers. While the tradition of Greek commentaries on Revelation did not start before the Byzantine era with Oecumenius and Andrew, the first extant Latin commentary comes from Victorinus of Pettau († 303 or 304) who wrote in the pre-Constantine era.[64] This does not, of course, mean that the Latin strand of the textual tradition of Revelation is superior to others, but it would be important to ask whether (and how) the material from Latin (and other) versions and authors fits into Schmid's overall pattern or not.

Finally, even some of the extant Greek witnesses to Revelation raise questions. Of course, we cannot answer the question as to what our overall view of the textual history of the Book of Revelation would look like if we had the full text of manuscripts like 0207 or $\mathfrak{P}^{98}$ and only fragments of A and א. This is not to criticize Schmid's methods, but to underscore the fact that all we have from the earliest periods are a few more or less complete uncials, a handful of fragments mainly coming from one area in Upper Egypt, plus some quotations from ancient Christian authors. Anybody who is constructing textual history (as anybody who is constructing history at all) should be aware of the fortunes and misfortunes of the transmission of sources—and s/he should be aware that more than 99 per cent of the material is lost. Of course, fragments of manuscripts like 0207 and $\mathfrak{P}^{98}$ are too small to call the overall theory into question, but the fact that they seemingly do not really fit the pattern should at least make us aware that whenever we work with constructions of (textual) history—we are always working with theories, never facts. The same could perhaps be said of an ancient author like Hippolytus, whose quotations, according to Schmid, 'on the whole affirm the text of the old uncials',[65] uncials which, however, fall into two distinct text types.

That is why I think it is time to raise the question as to whether and how overall theories about the transmission history of ancient texts guide our assessment of later findings or, in other words, whether and to what extent we make new findings fit into an existing overall pattern—a pattern that might be quite different had the *new* findings been available at the beginning.

[64] On Victorinus' interpretation of the Book of Revelation see K. Huber, 'Aspekte der Apokalypseinterpretation des Victorinus von Pettau am Beispiel der Christusvision in Offb 1', and M. Hasitschka, 'Ankunft des Herrn, erste Auferstehung und Tausendjähriges Reich: Die Schlussabschnitte im Apokalypsekommentar des Victorin von Pettau und die Hinzufügung des Hieronymus', both in Verheyden et al., *Ancient Christian Interpretations of 'Violent Texts' in the Apocalypse*, 94–117, 118–32.

[65] Schmid, *Studien*, ii. 164.

13

'Where Two or Three Are Gathered Together':

The Witness of the Early Versions

Peter Williams

INTRODUCTION

One of my favourite books on textual criticism begins as follows: 'The importance of the early versions of the New Testament is hard to overestimate.'[1] The quotation comes, of course, from Bruce Metzger's *The Early Versions of the New Testament*. This book, more than any other before or after has helped to set the use of the early versions of the New Testament on a reasoned and systematic basis. Yet despite my genuine appreciation of this work, I would like to offer some words of warning, partly in relation to this work, but perhaps more concerning its use, and certainly concerning the whole tradition of use of the versions in which this book stands as an example of better practice. I will maintain that, while the early versions are indeed important for historical, cultural, and linguistic reasons, in one respect their contribution has often been overestimated: they have been held to play an important role in deciding between Greek variants concerning which actually they give no clear testimony.

Of course, the early versions do have a significant role to play in establishing the Greek. However, as will be shown below, the number of variants in which they can help us determine the Greek has been overestimated. We will consider two basic issues: first, the general way in which versions appear in the textual apparatus and appear to swell the authority for a particular Greek reading and, secondly, the specific question of the level of agreement between Syriac and Latin witnesses in the Gospels.

[1] B. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), p. vii.

CONFIDENCE ABOUT THE *VORLAGE* OF A VERSION

If we tell the story of versional use beginning from the nineteenth-century editions of the Greek New Testament, we find that editions such as those of Tischendorf and Tregelles gave a prominent place to the versions within their apparatuses.[2] Thus, often the versions take up more space in Tregelles' apparatus than the Greek witnesses to which he devoted his life.[3] This tradition of using the versions has been continued in editions of the twentieth century, whether of von Soden, Vogels, or Nestle-Aland.[4] These editions thereby rightly signal that the versions may be used as witnesses to the original text and that they play an important role in doing so. Yet the question arises: how do the editors of these editions know what the version supports? Tischendorf and Tregelles, as we are aware, spent most of their time locating and editing Greek manuscripts. Von Soden had a team of workers collecting evidence from the various Greek witnesses. However, we do not have evidence that these editors undertook major studies of the translation method employed by the creators of the early versions. Their use of the versions in their apparatuses was therefore probably based on intuition.

A significant advance on earlier approaches was initiated by Kurt Aland, who, in founding the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF) in Münster, managed to draw together scholars competent in the major versional languages. Particular care of the Old Latin testimony was taken by the Vetus Latina Institut in Beuron, while specialists in Coptic and Syriac and many with good knowledge of Latin resided at the INTF. The manual Nestle-Aland editions have restricted versional quotations in the main to Coptic, Latin, and Syriac, because of the age of these versions. The Gothic had antiquity, but not the desired textual quality.

Aland wanted the versions to be used on a sounder basis and therefore became involved in the editing of the Old Latin Gospels,[5] and established projects to produce critical editions of the Syriac and Coptic. The principle was established that you could not use the versions in a critical edition of the

[2] C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869); S. P. Tregelles, *The Greek New Testament* (London: Samuel Bagster, 1857–79). Of course prominence was given to versions much earlier in the great Polyglot Bibles of the 16th and 17th cents.

[3] Consider e.g. the note at Matt. 1: 6: '*Δα. δϵ*] †add. *ὁ βασιλευς* ς. CL. 33. rel. Vulg. *Cl. & Am. a.c.f.ff*¹. Syr.Hcl. Æth. | *Contra*, B. 1. For. *g*¹²*k*. Syrr.Crt. & Pst. Memph. Theb. Arm.'

[4] H. F. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (4 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–13); H. J. Vogels, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, Pars Prima: Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum* (3rd edn. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1949).

[5] A. Jülicher, W. Matzkow, and K. Aland, *Itala*, i. *Matthäus-Evangelium* (2nd edn. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1972), ii. *Marcus-Evangelium* (2nd edn. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970), iii. *Lucas-Evangelium* (2nd edn. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1976), iv. *Johannes-Evangelium* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963).

Greek until you had a critical edition of the versions themselves. This principle was an important step forward, but we must note that, while manuscripts were edited and editions produced, the formal investigation of how to establish the link between a version and the Greek was rather limited. Gerd Mink at the INTF made an important study of how the Coptic versions might be used in textual criticism of the Greek,[6] but it still appears that there was no thoroughgoing investigation of translation technique that could establish for most variants what the witness of any version was.

As well as the work of the INTF, another enterprise, the International Greek New Testament Project (IGNTP, established 1948), had been working on editions. The single-handed attempts by Legg had not been judged reliable,[7] but after a long gestation the IGNTP's edition of Luke showed some refinement in the use of the versions.[8] Versional experts were used and editors included some who gave themselves to a detailed study of the versions, such as Neville Birdsall. S. P. Brock's involvement in the Syriac ensured careful treatment of that language. However, questions of translation technique were not systematically addressed. Continuation of the IGNTP in preparation for a major edition of John, now a collaborative venture with the INTF, has wisely sought preparation of new editions of the Coptic, Latin, and Syriac versions. However, the project has now to face the challenge of how to relate these versions to the Greek. In my view, the study of translation technique is every bit as essential to correct use of the versions as preparation of a critical edition. Arguably, in fact, study of translation technique yields *more* in terms of a change in the way each version is perceived than the change involved in moving from previous unsatisfactory editions to critical editions acceptable to modern standards.

Already some translation technique studies have been made by members of the IGNTP, such as Philip Burton's study of Old Latin equivalents and my own studies of Syriac translations.[9] However, what the project really requires is a documented translation technique study for every passage where it wishes to cite versional evidence.

Metzger, of course, advanced such study considerably. When he wrote his book on the early versions he invited specialists in each of the versional

[6] G. Mink, 'Die koptischen Versionen des Neuen Testaments: Die sprachlichen Probleme bei ihrer Bewertung für die griechische Textgeschichte', in K. Aland, ed., *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1972), 160–299.

[7] S. C. E. Legg, *Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1935); idem, *Evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940).

[8] International Greek New Testament Project, *The Gospel according to St. Luke,* i. *Chapters 1–12* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), ii. *Chapters 13–24* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987).

[9] P. Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels* (Oxford: OUP, 2000). For my own writings see the footnotes of this article.

languages to contribute a section. Each section is entitled 'Limitations of X in representing Greek', where X is the name of a language. Here for the first time we have rules formulated for eight major versions. The titles of these sections, however, need further unpacking. The sections take up from 6 to 17 pages,[10] averaging about 13 pages each. They are titled not as considering the limitations of a *version* in representing Greek, but the limitations of a *language* in representing Greek. The entries actually do not generally distinguish between the limitations of a language and of a version. Most entries deal partly with both. Consequently after listing such things as which sounds, tenses, or grammatical constructions *cannot* be represented in a language, the treatment of which features *can be represented but are not represented* may be compressed into half the article or less.

This was the situation for Syriac when I first began to notice problems in the Syriac notes of NA[27] during my researches on the syntax of the Syriac Old Testament.[11] The previously published literature on the Syriac New Testament only dealt with a handful of features, but if we consider NA[27], we have over 2,000 references to the Old Syriac or Peshitta in notes to the Gospels alone. Though critical editions of the versions have been and are being made, and the notes in the apparatus are drawn up by versional experts, and works like Metzger's have laid out some basic rules, it is clear that across the whole New Testament many thousands of notes are based on the expert's instinct about translation equivalence rather than on actual research. This means that an apparatus like that of NA[27]—which has a *far* more cautious approach to the versions than previous editions—can fall into rather elementary mistakes. Here are some examples.

NA[27] frequently cites the Peshitta in support of the phrase 'Jesus Christ' rather than 'Christ Jesus', when the Peshitta's preference for the former order seems to bear little relationship to its *Vorlage* and is rather due to the fixed preferences of Syriac expression. This means that there are at least eighteen misleading notes in NA[27] in which the Syriac is quoted without warrant.[12]

[10] Metzger, *Early Versions*, 83–98 [16], 141–52 [12], 171–81 [11], 199–214 [16], 240–56 [17], 362–74 [13], 388–93 [6], 431–42 [12].

[11] I indicated my first awareness of the problem in 1997: *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings* (Ph.D. Dissertation; Cambridge University, 1997), 120 n. 29, published as *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001), 98 n. 31. The published version reads 'the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edn, is normally more reliable, or at least less unreliable, than *BHS* in its text-critical notes as regards Syriac evidence'. The parenthetical remark 'or at least less unreliable' was absent from the original thesis, because at that point I had not yet realized the extent of the problem.

[12] See P. J. Williams, 'An Evaluation of the Use of the Peshitta as a Textual Witness to Romans', *TC* 13 (2008): 3.

Syriac versions have also been cited in support of singular or plural Greek nouns, when the number in Syriac is clearly dictated by constraints of that language.[13]

To consider a specific passage, in Matthew 4: 3 we have the following array of texts, including in the second line what NA[27] attributes to '(D it) sy^s.c sa?'.

txt	*καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ πειράζων εἶπεν αὐτῷ*
'sy^s.c sa?'	*καὶ προσελθὼν αὐτῷ ὁ πειράζων εἶπεν αὐτῷ*
v.l.	*καὶ προσελθὼν αὐτῷ ὁ πειράζων εἶπεν*
D	*και προσηλθεν αυτω ο πιραζων και ειπεν αυτω*
sa	**ⲁϥϯⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛϭⲓⲡⲉⲧⲡⲉⲓⲣⲁⲍⲉ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁϥ**
	'Approached him the tempter. He said to him'
sy^s	ܘܩܪܒ ܠܘܬܗ ܡܢܣܝܢܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ (cf. Matt. 13: 27)
	'And approached towards him the tempter and said to him'

At first glance the support for the reading of the second line is extremely impressive. It has one of the early uncials, '(D)', and versions in three completely different languages (although the Old Latin is said only to give qualified support). Together these versions imply wide geographical spread, including Europe or North Africa for the Old Latin and Syria and Egypt for the other versions. However, further study will rather reduce this attestation.

Clearly the editors of NA[27] thought that the Sahidic might support *αὐτῷ* after *προσελθών* because of the presence of **ⲉⲣⲟϥ** 'to him' after **ⲁϥϯⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ** 'he approached' in the Coptic. The problem with this is that **ⲉⲣⲟϥ** is frequently attested after **ⲁϥϯⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ** in the Sahidic throughout Matthew's Gospel, for example:

8: 2 *καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ*

ⲁⲩⲟ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲉⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲃϩ ⲁϥϯⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ· ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲧ ⲛⲁϥ

'And behold one leper approached him, worshipping him'

The same addition of **ⲉⲣⲟϥ** occurs in Matthew 8: 19; 25: 20, 22, 24; 28: 18.[14] Thus the Sahidic need not support what it is said to. Moreover, given the tendency of the Old Syriac witnesses to add pronouns after verbs (e.g. after *ἀκολουθέω*)[15] one might well hesitate to cite its witness with confidence. Thus

[13] P. J. Williams, 'Some Problems in Determining the *Vorlage* of Early Syriac Versions of the NT', *NTS* 47 (2001): 537–43; id., 'Bread and the Peshitta in Matthew 16: 11–12 and 12: 4', *NovT* 48 (2001): 331–3.

[14] See P. J. Williams, 'On the Representation of Sahidic within the Apparatus of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*', *Journal of Coptic Studies* 8 (2006): 123–5. Two recently completed doctoral studies at Cambridge University, by Christian Askeland and James Leonard, have also explored the translation technique of Coptic versions in rendering Greek.

[15] P. J. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2004), 263–72.

what we more probably have here is the superficial concurrence of a number of versions when these versions do not necessarily support the same text. What appeared at first impressive is not so impressive upon further investigation.

In the case of Matthew 4: 3 we could at least say that the parentheses round the Old Latin and the question mark accompanying the Sahidic would have given readers some pause about the witness of these versions. Yet one does not have to go far to find examples where three versions occur together without such expressions of reservation.

We consider now Luke 13: 27, where the basic text reads:

txt καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα [ὑμᾶς] πόθεν ἐστέ

א 579 *pc* lat sy^{p} sa bo^{pt} are said by NA^{27} to support the omission of λέγων. Again at first sight the array of witnesses is impressive. We have one of the most important uncials along with versions in three languages. The impression is given that the reading lacking λέγων was reasonably widespread, and that somehow the large numbers of Greek manuscripts that now survive do not adequately reflect the variety of Greek manuscripts that used to exist.

However, when investigated further the situation changes. For a start, in Greek ἐρῶ functions suppletively as the future of λέγω. Thus we should expect that, all other things being equal, it would be liable to be rendered by the same lexeme in the target language as would render λέγω. The versions may be able to tell us whether they read λέγων ὑμῖν or λέγω ὑμῖν but they do not tell us whether they read ἐρεῖ λέγων or just ἐρεῖ. This certainly is what we would expect in relation to the Syriac,[16] and may well be the case for the Sahidic as well. Evidence for the omission of an equivalent of λέγων at other points in Sahidic is slim, but the construction here is unique in the Greek New Testament. The fact that there is no object for ἐρεῖ means that a 'dummy' object would be supplied in Coptic,[17] so that it would naturally be translated **ϥⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ** 'he will say (it)'. Sahidic also typically supplies **ϫⲉ**, which we might overtranslate as 'saying' to mark the transition to the direct speech. However, unless one were to produce the monstrous ***ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ϫⲉ** 'and he will say (it) saying (it) to you (saying)' it is difficult to see how the Sahidic could possibly have rendered both ἐρεῖ and λέγων. Instead the translation has the completely idiomatic **ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ϫⲉ** 'and he will say (it) to you, (saying)'. In the case of the Latin Vulgate it is difficult to see how it could have formally rendered καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν except with the unidiomatic **et dicet dicens vobis* 'and he will say saying to you'. Of course, it did not do this, instead giving us the more natural *et dicet vobis* 'and he will

16 Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 249–62.
17 B. Layton, *A Coptic Grammar* (2nd edn; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), §§171, 514.

say to you'. Thus the attestation for the variant may be greatly weakened by a simple consideration of the constraints of the versions.

SYRO-WESTERN AGREEMENTS

I would like to come now to investigate a whole range of alleged agreements between Codex Bezae, Old Latin witnesses, and Syriac ones. Traditionally these have been said to be 'Western' readings, but when Syriac witnesses combine with the others I will call them Syro-Western agreements, without wanting to suggest thereby that they form a coherent group, that those designated by the title as 'Western' (D and Old Latin) form a text type, or even that all such witnesses come from the West.

These agreements have been a particular object of study since the 1890s when Frederic Henry Chase brought out two significant books, *The Syriac Element in Codex Bezae* and *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*.[18] While these books were not the first to record the link, they presented more systematically than had been done previously the evidence for wide-scale textual agreements between Syriac texts, Codex Bezae, and the Old Latin. Since then scholars have had to contend with the rather remarkable circumstance that there are significant textual agreements between a major textual tradition of the East (the Syriac) and a major textual tradition of the West (the Latin), and that these textual agreements are well attested in witnesses that may go back to the second century, but poorly represented in actual Greek manuscripts.

This raises the question of how representative extant Greek texts are. Or, to put it in the words of Westcott:

> The discovery of the Sinaitic MS of the Old Syriac raises the question whether the combination of the oldest types of the Syriac and Latin texts can outweigh the combination of the primary Greek texts. A careful examination of the passages in which syr.*sin* and *k* are arrayed against א B would point to the conclusion.[19]

Although text-critical praxis has not always taken this statement seriously I am unaware of any reasoned response to it by those who choose to reject its implications. The question of Syro-Latin relationships or of the relationship between Syriac texts and Codex Bezae has to be central to the discipline of New Testament textual criticism. With this question we consider the identity of witnesses associated with the idea of a text type called 'Western', of one of

[18] F. H. Chase, *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* (London: Macmillan, 1893); id., *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1895).

[19] B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix*, 2nd edn. (London: Macmillan, 1896), 328.

the most important uncial manuscripts, and of the two languages which first received translations of parts of the New Testament. How could any subject be more interesting?

Definition

We must first define what we mean by agreement between Syriac witnesses, the Old Latin, and Codex Bezae. Obviously we do not mean just any places where these agree, since most witnesses agree on most things most of the time, but that does not give us any insight into special genetic relationships. In order to get some idea of the size of the agreements between the texts I looked first only at those agreements significant enough to be registered in the apparatus of NA²⁷. I defined the type of reading as loosely as I thought I could, considering any reading attested positively by sy^s, sy^c, or sy^p (i.e. the earliest Syriac versions) and either D, or any Latin witness. Negatively the reading should not be the Byzantine one, nor that of any two of א A B C. These criteria were bound of course to lead to the recording of a greater number of readings than would be called ‘Western’ by anyone, or could show special relationship between witnesses. The formula is evidently rough. On the other hand, its roughness is also its strength: it does not exclude potentially ‘Western’ readings too early. It allows a wider range of readings to be considered at first.

There are some sections of the Gospels where there are no Syro-Western agreements. This is the case for a limited section such as John 15. For sections in which there were but a few sporadic agreements, it may turn out that these few agreements allow non-genetic explanations. In this case more stretches of text will have no point at which a strong genetic link between the ‘Western’ and Syriac traditions will be provable.

Another feature of this investigation may be to bring down the overall number of shared genetic readings. Doubtless some of the most striking agreements will remain. But if some are explained as non-genetic the relationship between the Syriac and ‘Western’ witnesses is proportionately less close and this will have to be taken into account in calculations of the level of common readings needed to define a witness as part of a textual family. Unfortunately such techniques of estimation have not yet been adequately adapted for the versions, where it is often not possible to say which of several variant readings they support.

My procedure has been as follows:

(1) maximize the list of potential Syro-Western agreements;

(2) maximally explore non-genetic explanations for these agreements.

By maximally exploring non-genetic explanations of agreements I am not seeking to disprove genetic relationship, merely making sure that when it is

proved it rests upon a solid foundation. The explanation of the relationship between the Syriac and 'Western' groups will ultimately depend on both a 'top–down' and 'bottom–up' process whereby a set of explanations is seen most plausibly to work both when readings are considered individually and when they are viewed as a whole.

Syro-Western Agreements in Mark

We will consider first the Gospel of Mark where I have begun a pilot study. I recorded approximately 142 Syro-Western agreements in Mark's Gospel. I think that those which we might call significant agreements would only be about half that number. I seek to show below that some Syro-Western agreements might be explained by causes other than that a Syriac text was translated from a text with a reading like D or the *Vorlage* of the Latin. I have as yet no firm idea how many of the agreements can be thus explained. I have previously identified over fifty such potential pseudo-agreements in the Gospels without making a systematic study of the subject.[20] Since then I have found success in a number of further instances, but I cannot give any figure for what proportion of the agreements will be explained this way. Rather, I find that my present line of investigation leads me to be dissatisfied with the generalized observation of Syro-Western agreements, since it reveals that these agreements may be of more diverse origin than they seem.

What is required, then, is a more systematic approach: we need to classify the various agreements bearing in mind the possible causes of each.

Before analysing Mark, we must first consider an aspect of Syriac syntax. It is well documented that very little in the use of pronominal suffixes in Syriac is a matter of choice and that there are situations in which Syriac would be consistently expected to use a pronominal suffix regardless of whether a possessive was present in its source Greek text or not. One of the clear situations in which this occurs is as follows: if there is reference to something that is possessed inherently (as opposed to possessed by acquisition), that is definite and occurs in association with an identified possessor then there will, of necessity, be a pronominal suffix marking the possessor's possession of what he or she possessed.[21]

Thus a 3 m.sg. possessive is added to 'hand' in Syriac witnesses in Matthew 8: 3 sy$^{s.c.p}$; 12: 10 sy$^{s.c.p}$; 14: 31 sy$^{s.c.p}$; 26: 23 sy$^{s.p}$, 51 sy$^{s.p}$; Mark 3: 1 sy$^{s.p}$, 3 sy$^{s.p}$; 7: 32 sy^{s};[22] Luke 5: 13 sy$^{s.p}$; 6: 8 sy^{p}, despite the fact that none is present in any

[20] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 307–9.

[21] See W. Diem, 'Alienable und inalienable Possession im Semitischen', *ZDMG* 136 (1986): 227–91.

[22] Some texts read a plural here, but still lack a possessive.

witnesses recorded by NA^{27}, Von Soden, Legg, IGNTP, or Swanson.[23] The same phenomenon is expected regardless of whether the possessor is first, second, or third person. The same addition of a possessive occurs with other inherently possessed nouns in the Syriac Gospels including cheek, eyes, face, hand, head, knees, leaves, left, lips, name, power, right, root, spirit, and voice.[24] The internal consistency of Syriac on this matter is so great that one can pick up a Greek concordance and, provided that the Greek is represented in a straightforward way in translation, accurately predict whether or not one will find a possessive in the Syriac.

This feature of Syriac will be called upon below to explain more than one of the variants. However, we now turn to our first variant.

Mark 1: 27

NA^{27}	τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ᾽ ἐξουσίαν
Θ	τι εστιν τουτο διδαχη καινη αυτη οτι κατ εξουσιαν
D	τις η διδαχη εκεινη η καινη αυτη η εξουσια οτι
W	τις η διδαχη η καινη αυτη η εξουσιαστικη αυτου
C	τι εστιν τουτο τις η διδαχη η καινη αυτη οτι κατ εξουσιαν
d	*quaenam est doctrina ista noua haec potestas quia*
sy^{s}	ܡܢܐ ܗܘ ܗܢܐ ܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ 'What is this(m.) teaching-new which there is to it authority?'
sy^{p}	ܡܢܐ ܗܝ ܗܕܐ ܘܡܢܘ ܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܗܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܕܒܫܘܠܛܢܐ 'What is this (f.) and what is (m.) teaching-this(m.)-new which is with authority?'

A few observations: (1) D does not make a lot of sense. (2) We may divide between those witnesses that have one question beginning with neuter τί, those that have one question beginning with feminine τίς, and those that have two questions, with the neuter being the former of the two. (3) sy^{s} has one question and sy^{p} has two. NA^{27} cites sy^{s} in parentheses in support of D's reading.

The way many might read sy^{s} is to hold that the masculine demonstrative ܗܢܐ 'this' modifies the masculine noun it immediately precedes. We have thus the phrase ܗܢܐ ܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ 'this new teaching'. Support for this

[23] Von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*; Legg, *Evangelium secundum Marcum*; id., *Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*; International Greek New Testament Project, *The Gospel according to St. Luke,* i. *Chapters 1–12*, ii. *Chapters 13–24*; R. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus* (4 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

[24] See Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 69–87.

interpretation can be found in the fact that in sy^{s} 'What is ...?' is a masculine construction but in sy^{p} a feminine one. Syriac has only masculine and feminine and a feminine naturally corresponds to Greek neuter. The neuter construction τί ἐστιν τοῦτο is therefore represented in sy^{p} by a feminine question, but the feminine question τις η διδαχη κτλ by the masculine. There is only one problem. Elsewhere in the Gospels phrases similar to τί ἐστιν τοῦτο occur. In Luke 16: 2 we have τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ; 'What is this that I hear concerning you?', where τί τοῦτο is rendered by the masculine ܡܢܘ ܗܢܐ 'who/what is this' in sy$^{s.c}$. Similarly in Luke 18: 36 ἐπυνθάνετο τί εἴη τοῦτο 'he was enquiring what this might be' becomes ܡܫܐܠ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܢܘ ܗܢܐ 'he was asking who/what it was' with the masculine in sy$^{s.c.p}$. Now the context of each passage needs to be investigated carefully, particularly for influences that might make Syriac prefer one gender to the other. What is relevant to Mark 1: 27 is that this may open the possibility of an alternative analysis of sy^{s}'s reading.

sy^{s} might not read 'What is this new teaching with authority?' so much as 'What is this? [pause] A new teaching with authority?' This would in fact be exactly the reading of NA[27]. In support of this interpretation we might suggest that for the demonstrative to precede the noun it modifies (as in the phrase 'this teaching') is the less usual Syriac order.[25] The Peshitta shows an acceptable order reading 'teaching-this-new'. Further investigation on the position of Syriac demonstratives is required.

Mark 4: 4

NA[27] records that D along with lat sy$^{s.p}$ and sa omit narrative ἐγένετο. A well-known feature of Hebrew narrative and then of biblical Greek is 'and it came to pass': Hebrew ויהי, Greek καὶ ἐγένετο or ἐγένετο δέ. It has been observed that this is not always represented in translation in the Old Testament Peshitta,[26] and the same may be said for the early translations of the Gospels. In nineteen places in the Gospels where no Greek witnesses whose variants are recorded in the major editions of the Greek New Testament lack narrative ἐγένετο, at least one early Syriac witness does not represent it by anything more than *waw*. Thus narrative ἐγένετο is unrepresented in the following texts: Matthew 7: 28 sy^{c}; 13: 53 sy$^{s.c}$; Luke 1: 23 sy^{p}; 2: 15 sy^{s}; 3: 21 sy^{s}; 5: 1 sy^{s}; 8: 1 sy$^{s.c}$; 9: 18 sy$^{s.c.p}$, 37 sy$^{s.c}$, 51 sy^{s}; 11: 1 sy$^{s.c}$, 27 sy$^{s.c.p}$; 14: 1 sy$^{s.c}$; 17: 11 sy$^{s.c}$; 19: 15 sy$^{s.c.p}$; 24: 4 sy$^{s.c}$, 15 sy$^{s.c.p}$, 30 sy$^{s.c}$, 51 sy^{s}. Thus it seems that this is a

[25] I. Avinery, 'The Position of the Demonstrative Pronoun in Syriac', *JNES* 34 (1975): 123–7. See also Williams, *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings*, 166–78.

[26] Williams, *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings*, 108–9.

regular feature of translation, particularly in the Old Syriac.[27] Therefore in Mark 4: 4, given the translation profile of the Syriac, we must seriously consider the possibility that the Syriac witnesses appear alongside D and the Old Latin coincidentally.

Mark 5: 23

NA^{27}	*ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ*
D	*ελθε αψαι αυτης εκ των χειρων σου*
sy^{s}	ܬܐ ܣܝܡ ܥܠܝܗ ܐܝܕܟ
	‘Come, put upon her your hand.’
sy^{p}	ܬܐ ܣܝܡ ܐܝܕܟ ܥܠܝܗ
	‘Come, put your hand upon her.’

Here in Mark 5: 23, where Nestle-Aland’s main text has *λέγων...ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ*, NA^{27} cites (sy$^{s.p}$) in support of D’s reading *ελθε αψαι αυτης εκ των χειρων σου*. At first sight the citation is manifestly correct. There is the double imperative in D corresponding to the double imperative in sy$^{s.p}$. There is also the possessive ‘your’ with ‘hands’. However, on second thought we must recognize that Syriac here *must* have a possessive with ‘hands’ since they are inherently possessed, definite, and associated with a definite possessor in the context. Therefore the possessive would be present in Syriac even if there were none in the Greek *Vorlage* of the Syriac. This narrows the gap between the Syriac readings and that of NA^{27}. The imperative, however, seems a stronger reason to associate the Syriac readings with D. And yet the problem here is that the Syriac imperatives could well have arisen from NA^{27}’s text too. This counterintuitive conclusion is supported by closer consideration: *ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς* is an imperatival construction and therefore would be naturally rendered in Syriac by two imperatives.[28] Considerations of vocabulary choice also suggest that the Syriac readings are closer to NA^{27} since the Syriac texts and NA^{27} use the verb ‘put’, whereas D has ‘touch’. D also by having *εκ των χειρων σου* is quite distant from the other texts. The Syriac texts thus may give support to the opposite reading to that for which they are cited. All things considered this is probably a pseudo-agreement between the Syriac and Codex Bezae.[29]

[27] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 159.

[28] A. G. Martin, ‘Le Palimpseste syriaque du Sinaï et le codex de Bèze’, in D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, eds., *Codex Bezae* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 250. Similarly, in Luke 7: 22 when the participle *πορευθέντες* precedes an imperative it is rendered by an imperative in sy$^{s.p}$.

[29] On this variant see further Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 79–80.

Mark 15: 43

D *τὸ πτῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*
rell *τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*
sy^{s} ܫܠܕܗ ܕܝܫܘܥ
'the corpse of Jesus'
sy^{p} ܦܓܪܗ ܕܝܫܘܥ
'the body of Jesus'

Mark 15: 45

D *τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ*
א B L Θ 565 *τὸ πτῶμα*
rell *τὸ σῶμα*
sy^{s} ܫܠܕܗ
'his corpse'
sy^{p} ܦܓܪܗ
'his body'

In Mark 15: 45 NA^{27} reads *τὸ πτῶμα*, but the majority of manuscripts read *τὸ σῶμα*. D has *τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ* and NA^{27} cites sy^{s} with ܫܠܕܗ 'his corpse' as reading the same. Sy^{p} has ܦܓܪܗ 'his body'. The fact that the two Syriac versions use different words, supposedly supporting different words in the Greek *Vorlage*, but both use a possessive suffix, can be accounted for by the observation that the possessive was obligatory in Syriac for such an inherent possession. The possessive in sy^{s} gives no reason to suppose a genetic link with D since 'body' and 'corpse' would both be inherent possessions in this context and therefore would have a possessive suffix. A further consideration may create more distance between sy^{s}'s reading ܫܠܕܗ 'his corpse' and D's *τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ*. Semantically Syriac ܫܠܕܐ and Greek *πτῶμα* are used exclusively for corpses. On the other hand, Syriac ܦܓܪܐ and Greek *σῶμα* may be used both for corpses and for living bodies. Given the overlap in meaning—all four terms *may* refer to dead bodies—we should be wary of making any presumption about equivalencies when the context clearly states that the body was dead. At least in Acts 9: 40, sy^{p} seems to render *σῶμα* by ܫܠܕܐ. Since the context made clear that the body was dead, the Syriac used the word for corpse. If the same occurred in Mark 15: 45 in sy^{s}, then it is possible that sy^{s}'s reading, rather than reflecting D's *τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ*, or NA^{27}'s *τὸ πτῶμα*, could even represent the text of A C W Byz, namely *τὸ σῶμα*. The possessive was unavoidable in Syriac; the use of the word specifically for 'corpse' to represent a more general Greek word was at least possible.

But at this point we need to turn back two verses for there NA^{27} records that D k and sy^{s} read *πτῶμα* 'corpse', where other texts read *σῶμα*. Here we have an exclusive agreement between the three most significant manuscripts associated with the 'Western' text. What we cannot rule out, however, is that sy^{s} simply prefers to use the word 'corpse' when the body is clearly that of someone dead.

Syro-Western Readings in Luke 24

We turn now to treat some of the areas of densest Syro-Western agreement and in particular the debated text, Luke 24. Positively the criteria are the same as for Mark: Codex Bezae and/or any Latin Bible manuscript plus the Old Syriac and/or Peshitta. Negatively, the variant should not be attested by any two of the following witnesses: $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ א A B C, nor by Byz. The full list of verses with such agreements is: 24: 1, 3, 6, 10, 13, 15, 18, 19, 23, 29, 30, 36, 40, 43, 49, 51, 52. We consider these in turn.

In 24: 1 the lack of an equivalent of *ἀρώματα* in sy$^{s.c}$ and the lack of this word in D and Old Latin witnesses is striking. This might occur through a *μασα . . . ματα* parablepsis with the previous word.

In 24: 3 sy$^{s.c}$ read 'the body of Jesus', whereas most Greek witnesses read *τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*. D and it omit reference to 'the Lord Jesus' entirely. Superficially therefore the Syriac witnesses agree with D in lacking 'Lord', but disagree in containing 'Jesus'. Looked at from another angle, the Syriac witnesses agree with all Greek witnesses except D in giving a name to the possessor of the body. Upon further analysis the agreement between these Syriac witnesses and witnesses lacking *κυρίου* appears more tenuous. This is because the Old Syriac version in certain sections renders both *κύριος* and *Ἰησοῦς* with ܡܪܢ 'our Lord',[30] while in other sections it renders both terms by ܝܫܘܥ 'Jesus'. Thus in the context preceding the passage in question sy^{s} (but not sy^{c}) has regularly used ܝܫܘܥ 'Jesus' to render both *κύριος* (e.g. 18: 6; 19: 8; 22: 61a) and *Ἰησοῦς* (23: 46, 52).[31] Hence, on two attested methods of translation a single Syriac term would have been the natural equivalent of both *Ἰησοῦς* and *κύριος*. If this is so how would *κύριος Ἰησοῦς* be translated? Of this we cannot be sure, but there is no reason to think that the same Syriac word would be used twice, and it is an observed phenomenon that when two Greek words share a Syriac equivalent and appear together in the same phrase the Syriac may render them both by a single equivalent.[32] In addition to this

[30] This occurs as the regular equivalence of *Ἰησοῦς* in certain sections of the Gospels: Matt. 8: 3–11: 7 (but note 8: 26) and John 1: 29–6: 5.

[31] I refer exclusively to when *κύριος* denotes Jesus.

[32] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 264, 267.

possibility it is also possible to derive sy$^{s.c}$ directly from the reading of D. After all, the name 'Jesus' is often added in Syriac witnesses. There are about thirty-five occurrences where Old Syriac witnesses add 'Jesus' in contrast to Greek witnesses. From a later stage of Syriac transmission, the Peshitta has 175 occurrences of the name 'Jesus' in Luke whereas the Greek of NA^{27} has only 88.[33] Clearly the addition of such a name is part of the translation profile (cf. for instance, the additions of 'Jesus' in sy$^{s.c.p}$ in Luke 24: 25 and 24: 38). For all these reasons it is extremely precarious to cite sy$^{s.c.p}$ in this context.

In 24: 6 it is questionable whether sy$^{s.c}$ read *ὅσα* with D c.[34]

In 24: 10 sy$^{s.c}$ are cited for the omission of *ἦσαν δέ* along with A D W *Γ*. This variant just fits the criteria established above, but the support for the variant is sufficiently wide that one would scarcely see this as a striking agreement with D.

In 24: 13 for *txt*'s *καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο* D reads *ἦσαν δέ δύο* (cf. it). The Old Syriac has ܘܐܬܚܙܝ ܠܬܪܝܢ ܡܢܗܘܢ 'and he was seen by two of them', which though, like D, lacking the word 'behold' nevertheless is almost certainly rendering *ἰδού* by use of a verb of seeing.[35]

In 24: 15 D a c e sy$^{s.c}$ all, according to NA^{27}, lack *αὐτός* and c e sy$^{s.c}$ agree in lacking *καί* before *αὐτός*. However, *αὐτός* is unrepresented in Old Syriac witnesses in Matthew 14: 2; Luke 8: 1; 9: 51; 16: 24; 22: 23; John 12: 24; 17: 8, and *καί* is also often unrepresented in Syriac.[36] No genetic connection is therefore required.

In 24: 18 there is a supposed agreement between it sy and a significant number of Greek witnesses in reading *εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν* for *txt*'s *εἷς*. Sy$^{s.c.p}$ do indeed have ܚܕ ܡܢܗܘܢ 'one from them', but they scarcely give support to the presence of *ἐξ αὐτῶν* since in Luke 15: 8 sy$^{s.c}$ have ܚܕ ܡܢܗܘܢ 'one from them' for *txt*'s *μίαν*. It seems then that this could be simply part of the translation profile of the Syriac.

In 24: 19 ℵ D sy^{p} supposedly agree in reading *λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ* instead of *txt*'s *ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ*. Many have noticed that early Syriac translations do not always represent pairs of items in the order in which they appeared in the *Vorlage*,[37] but the Old Syriac reads as *txt*. There is a remote possibility of influence from a parallel version (Acts 7: 22) in sy^{p}, but this reading may actually be an instance of genetic agreement with D.

[33] Full details of this phenomenon throughout the Gospels are given ibid. 23–37.

[34] Ibid. 146.

[35] Williams, *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings*, 179–80.

[36] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 122–3.

[37] I. Wichelhaus, *De Novi Testamenti Versione Syriaca Antiqua quam Peschitho Vocant, Libri Quattuor* (Halle: Orphanotropheum, 1850), 254; A. Gelston, *The Peshita of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 71; R. A. Taylor, *The Peshita of Daniel* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 320–1; G. Greenberg, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 30, 49, 52–4, 60, 140–1, 168, 181–2; D. Shepherd, 'Rendering "Flesh and Bones": Pair Reversal and the Peshitta of Job 2.5', *Aramaic Studies,* 3 (2005): 205–13; Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 203–35.

In 24: 23 D c e sy$^{(s.c).p}$ are cited for the omission of the second *καί*, but *καί* in the sense of 'also' is frequently omitted: Matthew 5: 39 sy$^{s.c}$; 7: 12 sy^{c}; 18: 33a sy^{s}, 33b sy$^{s.c.p}$; Luke 3: 14a sy^{p}; John 14: 12 sy^{s}.

In 24: 29 there is no need to resort to a genetic explanation for the superficial agreement of the Syriac witnesses with D in having one verb for *txt*'s *ἐστὶν καὶ κέκλικεν*.[38]

In 24: 30 sy$^{s.c}$ lack an equivalent of *μετ' αὐτῶν* and this forms a notable agreement with D e. This reading might be explicable by an *αυτον...αυτων* parablepsis.

In 24: 36 sy^{p} agrees with aur c f in supporting the plus *ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε*. There is doubtless some genetic connection here, but this is not a connection of the first generation of Syriac witnesses with Latin witnesses and is therefore of a different kind from the other variants we are considering here.

The absence of 24: 40 in D it sy$^{s.c}$ is indeed a striking agreement between these witnesses. Part of what draws our attention to the agreement is the isolation of these witnesses, and the variant is also striking because of its size. It is precisely this sort of variant that helps build the reputation of Syro-Western agreements as such an important phenomenon. There are, however, two potential mechanisms whereby this verse could be accidentally omitted. First, there is significant overlap between the wording *τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας* in v. 40 and *τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου* in v. 39, especially if, with some witnesses the second *μου* is omitted in v. 39. A scribe might naturally glance at the second occurrence of this phrase and believe that he had already copied it.

Secondly, we may notice that vv. 40 and 41 begin the same way in Syriac. To show this we cannot turn to the Old Syriac since it lacks v. 40. However, there is a clear resemblance between the beginning of v. 40 and v. 41 in the Peshitta:

v. 40 ܘܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܚܘܝ ܐܢܘܢ ܐܝ̈ܕܘܗܝ ܘܪ̈ܓܠܘܗܝ
'and when he said these things, he showed them his hands and his feet'

v. 41 ܘܟܕ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܗܫܐ ܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܚܕܘܬܗܘܢ ܘܡܬܬܡܗܝܢ
ܗܘܘ ܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ

'and when until now they were not believing from their joy and were wondering, he said to them...'

Both verses begin with ܘܟܕ 'and when', which is the Syriac way of rendering the Greek participles. What this means is that while the beginnings of vv. 40 and 41 bear little resemblance in Greek (*καὶ τοῦτο εἰπών* and *ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν*, respectively) they bear considerable resemblance in Syriac. The Old Syriac witnesses also begin v. 41 with ܘܟܕ . The way therefore that a Greek witness might have omitted v. 40 is by a parablepsis from v. 39 to v. 40.

[38] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 200–1.

The Old Syriac might have been translated from such a *Vorlage*, and it is conceivable that such a *Vorlage* could exist, with an identical text to that of D, but without genetic connection to it, if the same mistake occurred twice. It is also conceivable that the Old Syriac might originally have contained v. 40, but that the verse was omitted in the process of transmission in Syriac because of the similarity between its beginning and that of v. 41. However one judges the probability of these two possibilities will depend on factors about scribal proclivities that are almost unexplored for Greek and absolutely unexplored for Syriac. The existence of these possibilities does, nevertheless, go a significant way to demonstrating that such agreements need not be genetic.

In 24: 43 the plus in sy^{c} and other witnesses that 'he took the remainder [of the fish] and gave it to them' certainly has some genetic agreement with witnesses such as K *f*^{13} c r^{1}, which contain some plus here, but the Old Syriac witness is split at this point. The occurrences of equivalents of *λαβών* twice in the text in sy^{c} alongside its disagreement with the shorter text in sy^{s} may suggest that sy^{c} results from a revised translation. Sy^{s} represents the earlier text, but sy^{c} was imperfectly revised to conform to the longer text (something like K's *και λαβων ενωπιον αυτων εφαγεν και τα επιλοιπα εδωκεν αυτοις*). The reviser, however, failed to notice that *λαβων* had already been rendered and so rendered it again. If anything like this happened, then it is not the earliest form of the Old Syriac that agrees with the Old Latin, but rather that there was at this point a resemblance between the *Vorlage* against which the text of sy^{c} was *revised* and Old Latin witnesses (among others).

In 24: 49 𝔓^{75} א D lat and sy$^{s.p}$ among others are said to agree in lacking *ἰδού*. Since both 𝔓^{75} and א share this feature, this instance does not fit our criteria for Syro-Western readings, though as shown in the apparatus of NA^{27} sy$^{s.p}$ appear to be closer to 𝔓^{75} D than to א. Since what divides these latter witnesses is Greek orthography, the Syriac witnesses naturally cannot be called on to decide. Nevertheless, there is ample reason to believe that Syriac witnesses might not represent 'behold' in translation.[39]

In 24: 51 we have another of the supposedly striking agreements between א* D it and sy^{s} in omitting the theologically significant *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*. This is a well-known alleged 'Western non-interpolation' (omitted in the NEB, REB, and RSV) and scholars generally look for deliberate explanations for its inclusion or exclusion. We should note, however, that the phrase in question is bounded by the repeated letter sequence NKAIA, permitting a haplographic explanation of the origin of the variant. Here NA^{27} cites sy^{s} as a witness to the omission of *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, but sy^{s} literally reads ܐܬܪܝܡ ܡܢܗܘܢ 'he was raised up from them'. NA^{27} is right that the Syriac does not mention 'heaven', but the Syriac does have a verb of

[39] Williams, *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings*, 179–82.

vertical motion that is equivalent to ἀνεφέρετο. If the Syriac's *Vorlage* merely contained διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν then the vertical element in the Syriac translation would be unexplained. Since sy^{s} often represents two Greek phrases that are semantically related by using a single Syriac phrase, it is possible to explain sy^{s} in this instance as an abbreviation of the reading of the main text of NA^{27}.

In other words the decision in the apparatus of NA^{27} to portray the omission as they do is not a neutral observation of fact, but rather a decision about the boundaries of the omission. I would suggest that a mechanism for the omission of the phrase could be found in the sequence of five letters underlined: διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ αὐτοί . . .

In 24: 52 the omission of the last two words in καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν in D it and the lack of any equivalent for προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν in sy^{s} is striking. However, this could result from an αυτοι . . . αυτον haplography. In fact, one should note the five occurrences of αυτ* (four of which are αυτο* and three of which are αυτ*ν) in vv. 51–2. The question is whether such a haplography is likely to have occurred twice independently.

If we may sum up some preliminary conclusions from Luke 24: if there really were seventeen firm genetic connections in so short a text then a close relationship would be hard to reject. In some cases there was agreement between Syriac and 'Western' witnesses but this failed to point to a strong relationship between the two groups because of the nature of the witnesses involved in the readings. These readings met the general criteria which had been drawn up as an initial guide, but would not be judged as in any way confined to typically 'Western' witnesses. This includes the examples in vv. 10, 18, and 49. A further two examples (vv. 6 and 43) showed agreements between sy^{c} or sy^{p} on the one hand and a subsection of the Old Latin tradition. These agreements were most likely genetic, but were probably genetically peripheral: that which on other grounds would be reconstructed as the earliest form of the Syriac tradition does not contain them.

But there remain a selection of readings which plausibly attest a genetic relationship between primary 'Western' and Syriac witnesses. However, in no case was a genetic relationship absolutely necessary to explain the seeming Syro-Western agreement. The ones that will probably be considered the most striking agreements are vv. 1, 30, 40, 51, 52, but these all have in common the possibility of being explained by parablepsis, as discussed above.

I am aware that we are entering here upon an evaluation of the 'Western non-interpolations'. Of course explanations in terms of theological or literary development are possible and I am not disparaging them. However, we should avoid assuming that a theological explanation is always preferable to a mechanical one. Those who consistently prefer theological explanations need to explain why in a sequence of cases in which they prefer theological explanations it should just so happen that there would consistently be

plausible mechanical explanations. All these minuses co-occur with repeated letter sequences of three to five letters at their boundaries.

There are thus several possibilities for explaining the Syro-'Western' agreements. Syriac and 'Western' witnesses

(1) might attest the original text;

(2) might show a genetically related secondary reading;

(3) might show a secondary reading generated independently twice.

It is also possible to use a variety of explanations: for instance, treating one 'Western non-interpolation' as original and explaining another as a common haplography. The importance of the concepts of non-genetic agreement and of pseudo-agreements is not that one can always reach certainty in individual cases, but that these concepts must be factored into the calculation of genetic relationships.

There is, however, one consideration that probably militates against the recognition of the need for any widespread reassessment of Syro-Western agreements. Non-genetic explanations of agreement and explanations by pseudo-agreement might be seen as fundamentally *ad hoc* explanations. Even if they might be applied in dozens of cases the sheer argument from mass of readings might be felt to prevail. Here I would like to suggest ways in which these explanations need not be *ad hoc*.

Explanations by independent common haplography are possible if there are two independent traditions which show a tendency to haplography. Certain phrases invite haplography more than others and it is natural therefore that there might be some overlap between two traditions. The plausibility of this explanation will depend of course upon undertaking the rather difficult assessment of how haplographic a particular line of tradition has been. Nevertheless, over a significant stretch of text, like the Gospels, it is not improbable that this explanation could apply on several occasions.

The particular non-*ad hoc* explanation that has interested me is the explanation based on features of the Aramaic language. Syriac translations naturally show various features of Aramaic syntax and style. If the Bezan or 'Western' reading coincidentally overlaps with these, a pseudo-agreement is produced. It has, moreover, been suggested that Codex Bezae shows its own Semitic tendency.[40] It obviously displays certain knowledge of Palestine (e.g. mentioning Sepphoris in John 11: 54), and knows alternative Semitic etymologies, such as for the surname of Judas Iscariot. Matthew Black suggested that it showed more Semitisms than the main printed Greek text of the last century or so.[41] If

[40] Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 185.

[41] Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 3rd edn. (Oxford: OUP, 1967), 28–34.

this is the case then it is possible that there has been Semitic/Aramaic influence on the readings of Bezae, though this need not necessarily mean that these readings had a Semitic *Vorlage*. Any form of influence from language contact would suffice. What we have to reckon with here, however, is the possibility of independent convergence of Aramaic idiom seen in Syriac translations and Aramaic-influenced Greek in Bezae, which may derive from Aramaic input quite independent of the Syriac tradition. This is a direction that I suspect would repay investigation, though I do not have firm results to show. As a hypothesis, however, it does make room for regular pseudo-agreements without regularly invoking new *ad hoc* mechanisms.

A further objection to explaining such agreements between Bezae, the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac as non-genetic is the sheer number of such agreements. Even if one by one they can be picked off or 'explained away', someone might reasonably ask whether this procedure really does justice to the pattern as a whole. I believe I have shown that part of the pattern is that plausible non-genetic explanations readily suggest themselves in the majority of alleged agreements. That itself is something that should not be explained away. Furthermore, one has to take into account the fact that in so many of the alleged agreements the Syriac and Latin witnesses not only agree (at least superficially) but also *disagree* in some details. It is the regularity of this disagreement that would not be expected if they really had significant genetic affinity. The disagreement suggests that they may be coming to contain a similar text by different routes.

CONCLUSION

Studying the translation technique of early versions is vital and can significantly change one's view of their textual allegiance. It appears that often citation of versions in the textual apparatus without due consideration of their translation technique gives the misleading impression that the support for a particular variant is much stronger than it really is. When the versions are cited in support of variants attested by few or no Greek manuscripts it gives the impression that the extant Greek manuscripts only attest a small proportion of variants that have existed. However, to the extent that versions are shown only to be attesting variants that we already know about from extant Greek manuscripts, we should conclude that our extant Greek manuscripts contain a greater proportion than previously thought of all the variants that have existed.

III

Early Citation and Use of New Testament Writings

This page intentionally left blank

14

'In These Very Words':

Methods and Standards of Literary Borrowing in the Second Century

Charles E. Hill

The NT papyri give us direct access to a (fragmentary) form of text of most NT books which dates to the third century. For some books it is a date in the first half of the third century, and for a few we are privy to a text of the later second century, or possibly even earlier. Beyond this, aspects of the early papyri, including their paratextual features, have encouraged some scholars to draw inferences about the text at a stage significantly earlier than that of the manuscripts themselves.[1] Yet in spite of the increasing body of evidence, some scholars view the entire corpus of NT manuscripts as capable of implying very little about the NT books at earlier stages of their transmission. Putting great stock in the supposition that all the papyri (and versions, and later uncial and minuscule MSS) derive from a thoroughgoing attempt to stabilize the NT text in about the year 200[2] (revised down to 180 by William Petersen[3]), this approach instead proposes that for our knowledge of the text of the NT before this time we must rely upon what can be extracted from indirect sources, from the earliest quotations from and allusions to the NT texts by authors who used them. And the results of this extraction process are said to show that 'the text of the Synoptic Gospels was very unstable'[4] or that

[1] See this book's Introduction, and Ch. 2 by Scott Charlesworth.

[2] Pioneered by H. Koester, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 19–37.

[3] W. L. Petersen, 'The Genesis of the Gospels', in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 2002), 33–65, 'our modern critical text takes us back no earlier than 180'. Cf. D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 63, 200.

[4] Koester, 'Text', 37.

'between the acts, words and life of Jesus and their text stands nearly 150 years of textual chaos'.[5]

Searching for the text of the NT in the earliest Christian quotations is not a new idea. Calls for textual critics to devote more attention to patristic citations have sounded repeatedly throughout the modern history of the discipline, and they have not gone unheeded. Very significant contributions to method in investigating patristic texts have been made, as well as path-breaking studies of individual fathers and their texts[6] (as will be illustrated in the next several chapters of this book). What is new about the recent approach is the depth of its skepticism about the direct tradition, the actual NT manuscripts on which all modern editions of the NT have been based,[7] and the inversely proportional height of its confidence in the small 'reconstructed' portions of texts which can be harvested from early patristic and apocryphal sources.[8]

Besides the well-known, general difficulties associated with the search for the NT texts of early writers,[9] there are special problems pertaining to the earliest period (late first to third century). First, for much of this period we have proportionally fewer instances of what present themselves as clear, intentional 'citations'. Second, the NT quotations or borrowings we do have, particularly in authors before Irenaeus, show relatively greater divergences from the readings we have in the manuscript tradition. It is this latter phenomenon in particular, regardless of the witness of the direct manuscript tradition, which is taken to establish a clear picture of an erratic NT text.

[5] Petersen, 'Genesis', 63.

[6] B. Metzger, 'Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament', ch. 11 in Metzger, *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980), 167–88 (originally publ. in *NTS* 18 (1971–2): 379–400); G. Fee, 'The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 191–207; C. D. Osburn, 'Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism', *NovT* 47 (2005): 313–43. Often neglected is the patristic evidence surviving among early papyri, see S. R. Pickering, 'The Significance of Non-Continuous New Testament Textual Materials in Papyri', in D. G. K. Taylor, ed., *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 1999), 121–41.

[7] Petersen, 'Genesis', 62, advises the reader, 'it is of the utmost importance to remember that whatever sort of text (or oral tradition) early (pre-180) Christian writers were accessing, it was very different from the text we now find in our critical editions'.

[8] Ibid. 35, 'prior to 180, our sole source for "substantial" evidence about the gospels are patristic citations and evidence from the apocrypha . . . these sources offer us our *only* access to this period'.

[9] Cf. Metzger, 'Patristic Evidence'.

EARLY QUOTATIONS AND THE UNDERLYING TEXT

As an authoritative testimony about the early period, Petersen relies heavily on the statement of Kurt and Barbara Aland about the free-floating (*freischwebend*) nature of the citations of the NT up until Irenaeus.[10] Justin's manner of citation, the Alands said, 'is quite free. Earlier examples are even more allusive or paraphrastic. It is not until 180 (in Irenaeus) that signs of an established text appear.'[11] Petersen thus concludes that for the period before about 180 there was no established textual form of NT writings (or that there were several),[12] rather, 'clusters of sayings/episodes/parts of (what later became our canonical) gospels and epistles circulated...'[13]

One might well wonder what 'clusters of parts of epistles' might have looked like, but the main question here concerns the level to which the majority of those early NT borrowings alluded to by the Alands, and on which Petersen bases so much of his own research, ought to be trusted to deliver an accurate picture of the texts these early writers were using. The Alands' observation, it must be said, really concerns a manner of citation, not necessarily the text behind the citations. This might mean that we cannot be sure of that text's stability; it does not mean that we can be sure of its instability. Yet the Alands' statement is often taken to mean the latter, and emphatically so by Petersen. Attempts on the part of many scholars over the past century and a half to explain part of the 'allusive' or 'paraphrastic' early patristic evidence as due to the authors either citing from memory, or adapting their citations to suit the purposes of their writings, are not merely rejected, but derided by Petersen, who states four reasons for discarding such proposals.

First, constituting what he calls 'incontrovertible proof' of his position, is that 'many of the "deviating" readings found in the Apostolic Fathers *have parallels in other Fathers or documents*, where the same reading turns up in almost—and, in many instances, *precisely*—the same "deviating" form'.[14] This assumes, of course, that the authors were quoting from actual NT manuscripts, and doing so accurately.[15] Second, 'lapses of memory' cannot

[10] Cited in several publications: W. L. Petersen, 'What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?', in B. Aland and J. Delobel, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 136–52 at 149; 'Textual Traditions Examined: What the Text of the Apostolic Fathers Tells us about the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century', in A. F. Gregory and C. M. Tuckett, eds., *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 40–1; 'Genesis', 36; 'Patristic Biblical Quotations and Method: Four Changes to Lightfoot's Edition of *Second Clement*', *VC* 60 (2006): 417.

[11] Aland and Aland, *Text*, 55.

[12] This is what he alleges in 'What Text', 150, but in 'Textual Traditions', and in 'Genesis', he insists that there was no established text before 180.

[13] Petersen, 'Textual Traditions', 40.

[14] Ibid. 42–3; his emphasis. For examples, see his other publications mentioned above.

[15] e.g., Petersen, 'Textual Traditions', 42 n. 43.

explain the deviations, for these authors (it is assumed) were capable of memorizing the whole of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in their youths and therefore would have been able to memorize James or Matthew with ease.[16] Third, authorial 'adaptation of the texts' cannot explain the deviations, for these early writers would not have taken intentional liberties in the *use* of texts which they valued and wanted to preserve with accuracy. Hence, they must not have cared to preserve them with accuracy. Fourth, we know that texts evolve and 'when the issue is theology, the need to adapt and change the text . . . is overwhelming'.[17]

Petersen presents the academy with two (and only two) options: either the early citation is accurate, revealing that the underlying NT manuscripts were sloppy; or the citation is sloppy and this sloppiness must mirror attitudes toward the copying of NT books. It does not really matter which option one chooses, for both have the same result: the copying of NT manuscripts before Irenaeus was sloppy.

It is apparent that the issue of citation standards and methods is of critical importance. Do we in fact have a clear understanding of what second-century authors were doing when 'citing' a previous text? We know that when we cite a text we aim to do so accurately, without modifying the original author's words (even adapting the grammar of our sentences to that of the citation), or their meaning, and we aim not to distort them by disregarding their context. The assumption that ancient ideals and practices of citation were virtually the same as our own has had, and continues to have, a surprisingly robust life in scholarship on early Christianity. The same assumption also permeates the quest to understand the reception of New Testament (and other) writings in the first and second centuries, something of which I was made acutely aware when researching the early reception of John's Gospel. Examples of what may initially appear to be an author's use of John in, say, Ignatius or Justin are not infrequently disqualified as such by scholars on the basis of quite minor deviations from our extant NT manuscripts.[18]

For instance, Justin's statement (*1 Apol.* 61.1), 'For Christ also said, "Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven"' would appear to be an allusion to John 3: 3, 5. But Justin substitutes a single compound word, 'reborn' (*ἀναγεννάω*) for John's two distinct words, 'born' (*γεννάω*) and 'again' (*ἄνωθεν*), and the second part of the saying looks like it has been conflated (consciously or unconsciously) with the thematically

[16] Ibid. 44. By this logic we ought to expect exact verbal correspondence with the cited text.

[17] Ibid.

[18] For examples, see C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: OUP, 2004); id., '"The Orthodox Gospel": The Reception of John in the Great Church Prior to Irenaeus', in T. Rasimus, ed., *The Legacy of John* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), 233–300.

similar statement in Matthew 18: 3.[19] Because of these divergences Koester and others rule out this passage as evidence of Justin's knowledge of John, seeing it instead as indebted to a now lost liturgical (or other) source. This is despite the fact that the next words in Justin's text, 'Now, that it is impossible for those who have once been born to enter into their mothers' wombs, is manifest to all', clearly echo the reply of Nicodemus in John 3: 4: 'How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?'

Concerning both the reception of NT writings, and the search for the text of those writings, the infallible augur to which many tune their ear is the principle that authors of the second century always intended to cite their sources, as we do, with strict verbal accuracy and respect for context.

CITATION IN THE GREEK TRADITION

To gain some footing for our understanding of the phenomenon of early citations of the NT writings, therefore, it seems desirable to look at the literary environment in which Christian authors operated. For if Christian authors may be supposed to have memorized (and retained!) Homer, the same will surely have to hold for their pagan peers. And here it can at least be said that Koester, Petersen, and others have not availed themselves of a great deal of ancient evidence and modern scholarship on this subject.

If educated Greeks did indeed memorize the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in their youths, this apparently did not mean their abilities, or their appetites, to keep memorizing other literature remained high throughout their lives. Nor does it mean that it was always their intention to cite other texts with precision. Accuracy in reproducing another author's words, wrote E. G. Turner, 'is a presupposition of scholarship we take for granted, but it was not part of the tradition of classical Greece. Used to the cut and thrust of oral dialectic, the Greeks tended to be careless of exact quotation or copying and of precise chronology, undisturbed by anachronisms.'[20] Sabrina Inowlocki, who in several recent publications has examined the quotation practices of a variety of ancient authors, summarizes in this way:

> The major difference between a citation as it was understood in antiquity and a citation as it is understood today lies in the freedom ancient authors enjoyed not

[19] John: *οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεου*; Matthew and Justin: *οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*. Clement of Alexandria, in fact, clearly conflates Matt. 18: 3 and John 3: 5 (but in a way different from Justin), in *Protr*. 82.3, 'Unless you become as little children again and be born again, as the Scripture says, you will not receive the true Father, "nor shall you enter the kingdom of heaven"'.

[20] E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Oxford: OUP, 1968, 1980), 106–7.

> only in relation to the letter of the text but also in relation to its primary meaning. Unlike modern writers, they did not hesitate to appropriate someone else's text to establish that which they thought was the correct meaning. No ethical or legal guidance existed to keep them from the hermeneutical richness resulting from such freedom.[21]

Two Technical Factors: Rolls and Intermediate Sources

The greater inconvenience of checking a source contained in a roll (as opposed to a codex) for accurate citation would seem obvious, and indeed it has often been blamed for the tendency to rely on memory and for the resulting looseness in citation.[22] No doubt this was a factor. But because the eventual transition from the roll to the codex apparently did not bring with it a measurable 'improvement',[23] it is evident that we are also witnessing an intransigent cultural convention.

The impracticality of checking a source, and possibly the difficulty and expense of obtaining copies of many books for one's library, led to the widespread practice of making notebooks (ὑπομνήματα), *florilegia*, or testimony books for easier reference. Pliny the Younger tells of his uncle's custom (in the first century): 'in summer when he was not too busy he would often lie in the sun, and a book was read aloud while he made notes and extracts. He made extracts of everything he read, and always said that there was no book so bad that some good could not be got out of it' (*Letters* 3.5).[24] The process could of course be reversed, with the slave doing the note-taking.[25] The practice described was evidently common. Melito, bishop of Sardis (160–80), compiled for a certain Onesimus six books full of 'extracts (ἐκλογαῖς) from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Savior and concerning all our faith' (Eusebius, *HE* 4.26.12). An example from pre-Christian Judaism is the Qumran

[21] S. Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 71. H. J. Blumenthal, 'Plotinus in Later Platonism', in H. J. Blumenthal and R. A. Markus *et al*., eds., *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought* (London: Variorum, 1981), 213, notes that 'Explicit named citations are comparatively rare even in those Neoplatonists like Simplicius whose scholarly procedures most closely approach our own.'

[22] L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 2nd edn. (Oxford: OUP, 1974), 2; the same point made by Christopher D. Stanley, 'Paul and Homer: Greco-Roman Citation Practice in the First Century CE', *NovT* 32 (1990): 54.

[23] J. Whittaker, 'The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation', in J. Grant, ed., *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York, 1989), 63–95 at 63–4, n.1.

[24] Pliny says his uncle left him '160 notebooks of selected passages, written in a minute hand on both sides of the page'. This seems to imply the use of a codex for Pliny's notebooks.

[25] Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*, 35, citing studies by Skydsgaard, Münzer, and Mejer.

document *4QTestim*, a catena of texts from Deuteronomy, Numbers, and a lost apocryphal book attributed to Joshua.

The copier or owner might, of course, insert his own words into such testimonia books. Two examples from the library of Clement of Alexandria, his *Excerpts of Theodotus* and the *Eclogae propheticae*, were clearly never intended to be 'published', yet they were appended by someone to Clement's other works and are preserved in an eleventh-century MS and a sixteenth-century copy. The *Excerpts* (*ἐπιτομαί*) includes Clement's interactions with what he was copying, yet in such a way that makes it sometimes impossible to be sure where the words of Theophilus or another Valentinian writer end and where Clement's begin.

Thus in very many instances, if an author was actually looking at another text when composing his own, that text was an intermediate collection of come kind, already at least one level removed from the original, sometimes reworked,[26] and sometimes mislabeled. The use of such *ὑπομνήματα* as writing aids is seen in that sentences from the Clementine notebooks just mentioned 'appear in slightly modified form in Clement's other works'.[27]

All of this relates to the matter which Petersen considered to be incontrovertible proof that second-century writers did not cite from memory or adapt a text for their literary purposes, the fact that two or more patristic writers sometimes agree (or nearly agree) in reflecting a form of text not witnessed by the Greek manuscripts. This phenomenon, however, is not confined to Christian sources. In the philosophical tradition, John Whittaker notes examples of the same egregious quotations, allusions, or paraphrases of Plato turning up in two or more authors (e.g. Alcinous, Philo, Galen). Rather than seeing in these examples proof of a variant underlying text of Plato, he perceives instead 'a clear message regarding the general unreliability and irrelevance of these and similar adaptations from the point of view of the textual critic. Such adaptations are all too often divided from their source by a barrier of commentary and exposition.'[28] In other words, when it comes to such 'agreements' between fathers where no NT manuscript support exists, the influence of exegetical and homiletical customs in Christian circles cannot be ignored.

In his 1971 presidential address to the SNTS, Metzger warned that to accept agreements like these as independent witnesses to New Testament

[26] In Clement's finished works Annewies van den Hoek finds many instances in which Clement cites a sequence of passages from a given author. Often these sequences begin with relatively literal quotations and then become less literal and more abbreviated as they proceed, indicating that Clement was writing from notes which modified the texts: A. van den Hoek, 'Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods', VC 50 (1996): 223–43.

[27] R. P. Casey, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria* (London: Christophers, 1934), 5.

[28] Whittaker, 'Indirect Tradition', 83.

manuscripts that contained such readings 'is to overlook the possibility that they may have been influenced by common liturgical or exegetical traditions, transmitted from one writer to another. From the earliest times the Fathers studied and copied each other's writings to an extent that can only be described as surprising.'[29] The single example Metzger gives is a string of six different biblical passages in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4.6.32.2–33.2). The same six passages occur in the exact same sequence in Clement of Rome (*1Clem.* 14–15). A closer look confirms that the Alexandrian Clement was indeed not copying directly from his scriptural manuscripts but from the Roman Clement,[30] because the copying extends even beyond the scriptural quotations. That is, Clement even unwittingly copied down the *non-scriptural* words of his predecessor from *1Clem.* 16.1, 'For Christ is with those who are humble, not with those who exalt themselves over his flock' (*Strom.* 4.6.33.2 (GCS 4.262)). Here, then, we know that Clement was not consulting the biblical books themselves (though copies of them were available to him),[31] yet there is no indication whatsoever in the text of the later Clement to inform the reader that he was using anything other than Greek biblical manuscripts.

Samples in the Greek Tradition

Homer

Since Homer has been invoked, we may begin with him. The text of Homer had been standardized from the late second century BCE by the great Alexandrian scholars, Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus. And it is true, as Christopher Stanley says, that the citations of Homer from about that time on display 'the tangible results of the emphasis on rote memorization that lay at the heart of the ancient Greek educational system'.[32] This means that an author who chose to quote Homer could assume that educated readers (and what other kind was there?) would have known the standard 'Vulgate' text of

[29] Metzger, 'Patristic Evidence', 184. Also, 'Even the concurrence of several Fathers in citing a passage in the same manner may rest upon a chain of tradition that goes back to the initial acceptance of a critical or exegetical gloss that never had any New Testament manuscript authority' (186).

[30] Cf. A. van den Hoek, 'Clement and Origen as Sources on "Noncanonical" Scriptural Traditions during the Late Second and Earlier Third Centuries', in G. Dorival and A. le Boulluec, eds., *Origeniana Sexta* (Leuven: Leuven UP and Peeters, 1995), 99–100. See also her 'Techniques of Quotation', 235, where she notes that Clement often drew other OT quotes from Philo, Barnabas, or Hermas, instead of looking them up directly.

[31] Of course we cannot rule out that the biblical texts were checked at a correcting stage, but the text corresponds with virtual exactitude to the text of Clement of Rome.

[32] Stanley, 'Paul and Homer', 54.

Homer by heart.[33] Stanley finds in the four first-century authors he examined, 'The percentage of modified texts ... ranges from 6% in the case of Plutarch's *Poetry* essay, to 15% for Heraclitus, 24% for Strabo, 50% for the *Sublime* and 52% for the *Letter to Apollonius*.'[34] This means that in these five first-century works, the text that definitely existed in a standardized form, the text everybody knew by heart, was modified, on average, almost 30 percent of the time.

Stanley finds two types of modifications of the Homeric text which were common and clearly unobjectionable, the practice of conforming details of the text to the grammar of the citing author's sentences, and the practice of omitting redundant, irrelevant, or problematic material (words, or phrases, or whole lines).[35] He also finds that combined and conflated citations, 'Far from pointing to occasional lapses in memory ... seemed to reflect a high degree of literary artistry and to operate in direct subservience to the later author's literary purposes.'[36]

Herodotus

Compared with the universally known and widely memorized corpus of Homer, the texts of other writers often did not fare as well. Summarizing results of his study of the citations of Herodotus in ancient authors, Lenfant says 'A de rares exceptions près ce n'est *jamais un extrait,* un citation *verbatim*'.[37] He notes different ways authors treated the text of Herodotus: 'quasi-citation, paraphrase, résumé, allusion, remaniement, voire deformation ou attribution erronée'.[38] Lenfant advises that it is essential in using fragments of earlier authors to know the usages and methods of the citing author, keeping in mind that the same author has various practices of quotation.[39]

The Platonic tradition

In 1989 classicist John Whittaker published a study of the citations of Plato, a study which is not only seminal for work on the Platonic tradition but which, I would suggest, also has important implications for the Christian manuscript

[33] Plutarch, however, knew a non-standard text, and sometimes explicitly preferred its readings to that of the Aristarchan text (*Poetry* 26F). If we accept that both the *Poetry* essay and the *Letter of Condolence to Apollonius* were indeed by Plutarch, we see that (according to Stanley) his modifications of the text range from 6% to 52%, depending on the type of literature he was writing.

[34] Stanley, 'Paul and Homer', 78. *On the Sublime* is a 1st-cent. CE work, mistakenly attributed to Longinus; *the Letter of Condolence to Apollonius* is attributed to Plutarch.

[35] Stanley, 'Paul and Homer', 75.

[36] Ibid. 76.

[37] Dominique Lenfant, 'Peut-ne se fier aux "fragments" d'historiens? L'Exemple des citations d'Hérodote', *Ktèma*, 24 (1999): 119.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

tradition. Whittaker had just finished editing the *Didaskalikos* or *Epitome* of Platonic doctrines written by a Middle Platonist named Alcinous, and preparing an apparatus of Alcinous' sources. Alcinous, who wrote in either the first or second century CE, is thus contemporaneous with the earliest period of Christian writing, making his example particularly apropos to our interests. Whittaker reports, concerning Alcinous' 'enormous profusion of quotations and reminiscences of Plato in particular', that many of them were 'not only brief but also out of context . . . and . . . the vast majority of these borrowings diverged to a greater or lesser degree from the wording of their original'.[40] What accounts for these divergences? While not denying that many of them may be attributable to carelessness and faulty memory, Whittaker emphasized instead 'the persistent inclination of the scholars and writers of the ancient world to introduce into their quotations deliberate alteration'.[41] Whittaker thus faces head on a factor which most researchers had only hinted at.

Whittaker speaks of Alcinous' 'mosaic of Platonic phrases and reminiscences' and states that Alcinous' style 'is the scholastic style of his approximate contemporaries. He shares it in greater or lesser degree with Philo of Alexandria, Plutarch, Galen, and especially the Stoicizing Arius Didymus';[42] 'His technique of manipulating the text of Plato and others is not peculiar to himself but at the very least characteristic of his epoch, and in a large measure of Greek literature generally.'[43]

It strikes me that this 'technique' is also very reminiscent of the way various NT writings are appropriated in Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* in particular, and to a lesser extent in the letters of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and other early Christian authors. Whittaker's analysis of Alcinous allows him to conclude 'that the *Didaskalikos* was designed primarily for readers who had already the Platonic corpus and much other philosophical literature at their fingertips, and who could recognize and place whatever Platonic and other titbits were put before them.'[44]

It is interesting then to note the contrasting approaches. Petersen argues that the altered sequence of words in some early Christian authors' borrowings from the Gospels 'evinces either a different text in the second century (if the writers were quoting accurately), or a very casual attitude towards a text that was not yet considered sacrosanct'.[45] Whittaker says, on the other hand, that variations in word order in literary borrowings of the period were so common as to be textually insignificant. He examines one of Plato's lists in particular,

[40] Whittaker, 'Indirect Tradition', 66.
[41] Ibid. 64.
[42] Ibid. 68.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid. 66.
[45] Petersen, 'Genesis', 55.

consisting of three elements, which subsequent readers in their allusions change by omitting the first element and then reversing the order of the second two, and, in the case of Alcinous, substituting a different word for one of these two. Instead of seeing in this evidence for a profusion of now lost, variant texts of Plato, Whittaker views it as evidence of a tradition of Platonic scholarship, in which one Platonic scholar copies and perhaps modifies another.[46] This has a very close parallel in one of Petersen's favorite examples from Christian literature, Justin's 'deviant' citation of the *shema*, but Petersen regards the deviation as proof of the existence of a now-lost Gospel text which differs from any of our Greek manuscripts.[47]

Whittaker argues that the practice of substituting similar, or interpretative, words was integral to the process of commentary and exposition and served the author's desire to put a personal mark on the text he appropriated.[48] The common substitutions, he said,

> expose the textual critic to potential danger. They can induce the conclusion that the textual tradition of an author was more confused from an early date than was necessarily the case, and they can delude the unwary into treating as genuine variants formulations that belong exclusively to the realm of interpretation and exposition.[49]

Another important aspect of Whittaker's research concerned authors' conflations of different passages of Plato, or, their conflating of passages from Plato and Aristotle, 'employed to illustrate the supposed unanimity of Plato with Aristotle, or with any other school of philosophy'.[50] This forms a parallel to the many (usually harmonizing) conflations of passages from the Gospels in quotations and paraphrases in Justin, Theophilus, Clement, and others. Such conflations of Gospel materials have often been read as indicative of a wild or uncontrolled text and/or of an attitude which did not hold the Gospel text as 'sacrosanct'.[51] Whittaker's researches would call this into question.[52]

Whittaker did not deny that something might be learned from the *Didaskalikos* about the text of Plato used by Alcinous. But concerning the *Didaska-*

[46] Whittaker, 'Indirect Tradition', 78.

[47] Treated by him in Petersen, 'What Text' and in 'Genesis'. See also A. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), and the observations of A. van den Hoek, 'Divergent Gospel Traditions in Clement of Alexandria and Other Authors of the Second Century', *Apocrypha*, 7 (1996): 60–1.

[48] Whittaker, 'Indirect Tradition', 86.

[49] Ibid. 86.

[50] Ibid. 90.

[51] Petersen's treatment of Theophilus' 'citation' of Matt. 5: 44, 46 in *Ad Autol.* 3.14 would be a case in point ('Genesis', 40). Contrast the findings of van den Hoek, 'Techniques of Quotation', 236, on Clement's method of citation.

[52] For an example of an exegetical tradition combining John 4: 14 and 7: 38 with Rev. 22: 1 in both Irenaeus and the *Epistle of Vienne and Lyons*, see Hill, 'Orthodox Gospel', 244–6.

likos he says, 'What one must not do is look upon as genuine variants those peculiarities in Alcinous' citations of which there is no evidence in the direct tradition of Plato, even when these peculiarities are attested in other secondary sources.'[53]

Philo citing Plato

David T. Runia thinks Whittaker's study 'should be compulsory reading for all scholars and students working in the area of later ancient texts'.[54] As a complement to it, he offers his own analysis of Philo's citations of Plato. While the Alexandrian generally adheres reasonably closely to the text of Plato as we know it from the manuscripts, there is a fairly wide range in the degree of faithfulness. Of twenty-three pertinent passages, five appear virtually *verbatim*, and these are long quotations, 'too long to be cited from memory'.[55] Among the changes in the other passages Runia notes inversion of word order, substitution of verbs, modernization of terminology, replacement and *variatio,* improvement, deletions, and adaptation in the context.[56]

Runia explicitly proposes that Whittaker's work could have important implications for the issue of early Christian quotations of the New Testament, concluding that 'the indirect tradition, while undoubtedly remaining interesting and valuable in its own right, is of restricted usefulness in the establishment of the original text'.[57]

Plutarch citing Plato and others

Plutarch the biographer, historian of religion, and Platonic philosopher, wrote in the late first and early second century, exactly contemporary with Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, Papias of Hierapolis, and perhaps Ps. Barnabas, among others. In their 1959 study of Plutarch's quotations, Helmbold and O'Neil wrote,

> Almost certainly Plutarch did not verify his quotations, or did so rarely, by looking up the passage in his texts. His memory was prodigious, and his confidence in it no less so . . . But he committed the kind of error that one almost

[53] Whittaker, 'Indirect Tradition', 94 n. 51.

[54] David T. Runia, 'The Text of the Platonic Citations in Philo of Alexandria', in Mark Joyal, ed., *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), 261. The present writer could not agree more.

[55] Ibid. 286.

[56] From his summary, ibid. 287. He thinks that in five cases modifications 'can be traced back to theological considerations'. The range of adaptations from a single word to over a hundred, in one passage, 'indicates how varied and flexible the ancient method of citation was' (286).

[57] Ibid. 261.

always makes in citing from memory ... He had also ὑπομνήματα, as he tells us (*Mor*. 464F and L.C.L. vol. VI, p. 163), full of quotations that he made as he read. He would, of course, use these 'note books' rather than the texts from which he had originally copied.[58]

They further noted that 'even where, in two or more places, Plutarch explicitly quotes the same passage κατὰ λέξιν, there are often slightly different versions'.[59] Whittaker, however, contests Helmbold and O'Neil's explanations for the discrepancies as due to carelessness in copying, use of different sets of notes, or faulty memory. Rather, he observes, 'It was not a part of Plutarch's objective to preserve for posterity the fragments of texts which he quoted, but only to exploit them according to current literary convention.'[60] Many of the variants in the indirect textual tradition of the fragments of Parmenides, Whittaker suggests, should be explained in the same way.

Sacred Citations: A Special Case?

It could be supposed, however, that words or writings considered sacred ought to prove exempt from the type of treatment which we have seen characterized citation practice in general. When early citations of NT books are judged to be inexact, this has led to firm conclusions that these books could not have been regarded as holy, scriptural, or even particularly valuable by those who used (and then by those who copied) them. Religious sanctity, it is thought, should guarantee the exact reproduction of texts in quotations. 'As we all know,' says Petersen, appealing to common knowledge, 'habits of accuracy permeate one's life. One does not work tirelessly, preserving a text with the utmost accuracy, only to cite it carelessly when writing theological treatises.'[61]

Porphyry

But did ancient writers indeed know this? Whittaker and Inowlocki each highlight the example of Porphyry, the third-century critic of Christianity, who wrote his own book, *Of the Philosophy to be derived from Oracles*, to collect and comment on words of the gods delivered through the sacred oracles. In his introduction Porphyry makes a solemn pledge to the reader:

[58] W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O'Neil, *Plutarch's Quotations* (Oxford: American Philological Association, 1959), p. ix. See also J. P. Hershbell, 'Plutarch's "De animae procreatione in Timaeo": An Analysis of Structure and Content', *ANRW* 2/36/1 (1986): 234–47, who says Plutarch 'sometimes added or deleted words, or substituted equivalent words or phrases for those used by Plato' including the important substitution of ὕλη for χώρα (240).
[59] Helmbold and O'Neil, *Plutarch's Quotations*, p. ix.
[60] Whittaker, 'Indirect Tradition', 65 n. 4. He gives a particular example, pp. 80–1.
[61] Petersen, 'Textual Traditions', 44.

> For I myself call the gods to witness, that I have neither added, nor taken away from the meaning (νοημάτων) of the responses, except where I have corrected an erroneous phrase, or made a change (μεταβέβληκα) for greater clearness, or completed the metre where defective, or struck out (διέγραψα) anything that did not conduce to the purpose; so that I have preserved the sense (νοῦν) of what was spoken untouched, guarding against the impiety of such changes, rather than against the avenging justice that follows from the sacrilege (ἀσέβειαν).[62]

Porphyry regards it as sacrilege and an invitation to avenging justice to omit or add to these sacred words. But what is surprising is his idea that he can preserve the sanctity of the words while introducing an extraordinary number of changes! He could correct what he deemed was an erroneous phrase, make changes to achieve greater clarity, restore what he though was the proper metre, omit words to suit his literary purpose, as long as he preserved what he considered was 'the meaning' or 'the sense' of the oracle. As Whittaker points out, Eusebius did not chastise Porphyry for his approach, probably because it was utterly unremarkable.[63]

Philo

One might imagine, however, that Jewish attitudes towards their scriptures might have been rather less lenient. There can be no question, for example, that Philo regarded scripture as holy and divine.[64] And this sanctity pertained not only to the Hebrew text; Philo also regarded those who translated the Law into Greek as 'not mere interpreters but hierophants and prophets'[65] who were given the same pure spirit of Moses (*De Vita Mosis* 2.7.40). Yet Ryle noted already in 1895 that 'A very large number of Philo's quotations are so much interspersed with paraphrase and comment, that no confidence can be felt as to the actual text which Philo was using'.[66] Ryle gives a long list of the kinds of alterations of scripture found in Philo, including paraphrasing, frequent omissions, additions, verbal substitutions for rhetorical or ameliorating purposes, and interchanging prepositions.[67] Philo's variations 'demonstrate that

[62] Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 4.7.1.

[63] Whittaker, 'Indirect Tradition', 70.

[64] e.g. 'these laws were not the inventions of men, but the most indubitable oracles of God (θεοῦ χρησμούς)', *De Decalogo*. [4].15 (Yonge); Moses composed the holy books 'under Divine direction (ὑφηγησαμένου θεοῦ)', *De Vita Mosis* 2.[2].11.

[65] Philo uses these two nouns to describe Moses himself in *Leg. Allegor*. 3.60.173.

[66] H. E. Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture, or, The Quotations of Philo from the Books of the Old Testament* (London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895), p. xxxvii. For a review of discussions (Kalhe, Katz, Barthélemy) of an aberrant Greek biblical text in some of Philo's writings, thought to be the work of later reviser, David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature* (Assen and Minneapolis: Van Gorcum and Fortress Press, 1993), 24–5. See also, on Philo's use of non-Torah writings, Naomi B. Cohén, *Philo's Scriptures* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007).

[67] Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, pp. xxxvii–xxxix.

Philo did not attach great importance to the verbal exactness of his quotations' even of the divine oracles of holy scripture.[68]

A more recent study of two Philonic works (*Legem Allegoria* and *De Ebrietate*) by Christopher Stanley only confirms these earlier results.[69] Stanley observes that biblical verses 'are quoted verbatim when it suits the purposes of the author, but Philo shows no scruples about conforming the language of a quotation to its new context where the change would help his argument'.[70]

Philo's influence on many early Christian authors, particularly the Alexandrians, was significant and is well documented. Christian readers of Philo surely observed his techniques in citing the sacred books, and apparently did not think it so unworthy that they could not cite similarly.

Josephus

We have also the example of Josephus, writing near the end of the first century to a pagan Roman audience. Josephus is quite clear that the twenty-two books of scripture were written by the prophets under the inspiration of God and are therefore to be trusted (*Contra Apionem* 1.37). He maintains that no one had dared to change even a syllable of these writings since the time of Artaxerxes (*CA* 1.8.42). He promises the reader at the beginning of the *Antiquities* (1.17) that he would not add anything to or subtract anything from the scriptures, a promise reported as fulfilled at the end (20.260–3). But from our point of view, he did both quite freely (*Ant.* 1.17; 10.218, cf. 4.196; 14.1).[71] In Steve Mason's judgment, Josephus offers 'a thoroughly tendentious interpretation of the records rather than a translation. He omits a great deal, adds significant portions, and casts the whole history into a frame that suits his literary purposes'; 'his biblical paraphrase does not consistently coincide with any known version of the text or rabbinic halakah or haggadah'.[72]

Josephus' forthright claim to have fulfilled his promise seems to stand in the way of our thinking that he was engaging in literary subterfuge. Mason

[68] Ibid., p. xxxviii. Ryle also (p. xxxix) lists instances in which he believed that Philo's variations reveal variations in the Greek MSS or in the Hebrew text, noting the possibility, however, that some of these too are due to Philo's 'inaccuracy and looseness in quotation'.

[69] C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992). By contrast, however, Stanley observes that 'Philo habitually quoted the Homeric epics verbatim according to the vulgate text' (326).

[70] Ibid. 334.

[71] S. Inowlocki, ' "Neither Adding nor Omitting Anything": Josephus' Promise Not to Modify the Scriptures in Greek and Latin Context', *JJS* 56 (2005): 48–65.

[72] S. Mason, 'Josephus and his Twenty-Two Book Canon', in L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), 120. See also N. Perrin, 'Hermeneutical Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels and the Question of Textual Authority', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. De Jonge, eds., *The Biblical Canons* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 2003), 600–1. Also Inowlocki, 'Neither Adding Nor Omitting', 55.

concludes that Josephus 'was largely insensitive to what we post-Enlightenment readers expect in view of his promises'; Inowlocki argues that Josephus, like the ancients in general, 'perceived accuracy or faithfulness to the text in a manner very different from us'.[73] From her examination of what Plato said about words, what Cicero said about translating, and what Porphyry, Aristobulus, and others said about citation, Inowlocki argues that if an ancient author preserved the meaning, the *vis* or δύναμις of a text, he had been faithful with the text. And this pertained to sacred scriptures as well.

Jubilees *and Pseudo-Philo*

Nicholas Perrin makes the same point from other Jewish 'rewritten Bible' literature. Like Josephus, *Jubilees* too conflates biblical passages which describe the same event, and engages in the reordering of the biblical narrative.[74] In Pseudo-Philo's *Antiquities* one finds the same harmonizing tendencies observed in *Jubilees* and Josephus. Yet each one, and explicitly Josephus, seems to acknowledge the authority of the scriptural texts they 'rewrite'.[75] The 'harmonizing' impulse, indeed, is born of the conviction that the individual sources being harmonized cannot truly disagree. Perrin concurs: 'in the Jewish tradition (to which Christianity at this stage still belongs) texts were rewritten precisely because they were regarded as authoritative'.[76] Perrin explicitly relates these findings to the harmonizing tradition of the Gospels found in Justin and Tatian.

Justin

I cite one instance from a Christian author, due to its particular poignancy. Oskar Skarsaune argues that in Justin's *First Apology* (but not in the *Dialogue*) Justin's citations of the Greek OT often come not from continuous OT manuscripts but from a book which contained excerpts. These citations, in comparison with known exemplars and even with Justin's citations in the *Dialogue*, show substitutions of words, changes in the forms of verbs, and the omission of words or whole lines.[77] In one such citation (*1Apol.* 32.1) Justin's version of Genesis 49: 10–11 omits a line of text, and to compensate changes the next finite verb to a participle, and then rearranges and conflates the words

[73] Inowlocki, 'Neither Adding Nor Omitting', 55.
[74] Perrin, 'Harmonization', 601–2.
[75] Ibid. 603 points as well to 'the numerous examples of the rabbis attempting to harmonize Torah' in the Mishnah.
[76] Ibid. 605.
[77] See O. Skarsaune, 'Justin and his Bible', in S. Parvis and P. Foster, eds., *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 53–76 (+ 179–87), 55, 59–60.

of the final clause. One might argue that Justin was unaware of all this as he cited from his abbreviated, intermediate source, and yet, he does make a point in *Dial.* 53 from the scriptural words which are omitted in *1 Apol.* 32. In either case, what is interesting is that he introduces the shortened form in *1 Apol.* 32.1 with the words, 'Moses, the first of the Prophets, spoke thus in these very words (εἶπεν αὐτολεξεὶ οὕτως)'.

Did Christians Contribute to a New Attitude towards Citation?

Clearly, even a stated and sincerely held regard for the sacredness of a text did not necessarily affect an author's practice of what we would call loose or adaptive citation. Literary Christians inherited, took part in, and contributed to a literary culture, Greek, Roman, *and Jewish*, which did not consider that the chief purpose of literary borrowing was to guarantee for the reader an exact replication of the text appropriated. Even when citing sacred texts, and doing so 'in these very words', this might be the case. Such deviating citations, moreover, continue in the writings of later church fathers, long after the hypothetical 180 CE recension and even after the 'established' recensions of the fourth century (if they may be called that).[78] Authorial habits differ, intentions differ, but the effects of cultural convention cannot be ignored.

What we have seen in our brief review may well make one wonder if we do not see emerging in Christian writers of the late second century and beyond a *greater* concern for verbatim citation, particularly of scriptural texts, than in their non-Christian contemporaries. Inowlocki sees in Eusebius a strong departure from the citation practices that characterized the scholarly world of antiquity and toward something recognizably more modern, an intention to cite and to cite literally.[79] Her suggestion of the cause for this is the defensive, polemical situation in which Eusebius found himself. But I wonder if we do not see the roots of this new turn in some of Eusebius' theological forebears.

Alexander Souter observed that Irenaeus is 'the earliest surviving writer of the Christian era who quotes the New Testament both extensively and accurately'.[80] If this is indeed the case, we must say that it is not his predecessors

[78] See e.g. Metzger, 'Patristic Evidence', on Chrysostom; C. D. Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2004) on Epiphanius.

[79] Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*, 71; cf. 50. Others have pointed to a similar exceptional attitude on the part of Philodemus of Gadara. Inowlocki points to the controversial setting for both authors as a cause for the different practice.

[80] A. Souter, 'The New Testament Text of Irenaeus', in W. Sanday and C. H. Turner, eds., *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis* (Oxford: OUP, 1923), p. cxii. As noted above, K. and B. Aland later wrote that, based evidently on his citations, Irenaeus shows the first signs of having a stable NT text. If Irenaeus had a stable text, it was not a recently stabilized text. He valued old texts (AH 5.30.1), and thought the text had come down to him accurately from his forebears.

who stand out as unusual, it is Irenaeus! The question is not, 'why do earlier authors cite the NT writings so loosely' but 'why does Irenaeus cite more accurately?'

There are probably several factors which play a part. Since we have seen that 'looseness' of citation is no good indicator of a low esteem for the cited work, and that strict citation is no good indicator of sacredness, we cannot point to 'evolving notions of sacredness or canonicity' as a factor in whatever change may be apparent. Besides, we see from the earliest of times a very high regard shown among at least some Christians for the writings which now constitute the NT.[81]

Perhaps primarily, the change had to do with the type of literature Irenaeus was writing. Before Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria we have hardly any Christian literature which could be categorized as exegetical or polemical, wherein the actual words of writers quoted are something to be argued about. It has been observed that Clement of Alexandria often quoted more scrupulously those writers with whom he disagreed![82] Clearly this has much to do with the polemical situation, in which the author could envision his opponent arguing back and accusing him of twisting words.

Second, it is probably also the case that we are simply seeing the result of Christian scriptures becoming more widely known, and possessed.[83] As long as the majority of one's readership was unlikely to own their own copies of NT books, and just as likely to have heard them read and expounded with homiletical embellishment, there was less reason for an author to imagine that his borrowings would be checked and challenged, and more reason to engage in the same sorts of adaptations made in sermonic or catechetical settings. Correspondingly, along with a greater familiarity with the actual text on the part of readers came a greater awareness that one's quotations might be recognized. We see this in the relatively greater fidelity in the citation of the widely known and memorized text of Homer, such that Philo's Homeric quotations show a considerably higher degree of accuracy than do even his scriptural quotations. This certainly did not have to do with sacredness but with an awareness of a greater familiarity with the text on the part of educated Greek readers.

Third, it is writers of Irenaeus' generation who are perhaps the first to have had access all their lives to codices of biblical books (including OT books) instead of rolls. I cannot but think that this distinctive form of presentation for Christian scripture, which allowed looking up passages with somewhat greater

[81] See Ch. 4 of this volume.

[82] Van den Hoek, 'Techniques of Quotation', 233.

[83] This is much akin to what B. Aland, 'Die Rezeption des neutestamentlichen Textes in den ersten Jahrhunderten', in J.-M. Sevrin, ed., *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1989), 1–38, calls a 'text consciousness'.

ease, played some part in a changing practice, at least regarding scriptural quotation.

This 'bookishness' on the part of Christians, possibly reflected in an increasing regard for accurate citation, is something which has left at least one typological remnant. No specific terminology for citation existed in antiquity, nor any accepted theory regarding it.[84] Very occasionally and irregularly, scribes used markings of one kind or another in the left margin of a text, or indenting or outdenting of the first letter of a line, to indicate the presence of a quotation. In these instances, such scribal features 'indicate that ancient readers/writers were aware that they were dealing with a specific literary technique'.[85] Here I wish to draw attention to a scribal activity which demonstrates such an awareness on the part of Christians.

Two of the earliest surviving non-biblical Christian MSS (each is a roll), each dated by its editor to the late second or early third centuries, contain a wedge-shaped marginal mark (>), known to ancient scholars and readers as a διπλῆ, to mark lines in which the author has quoted from scripture.[86] The first is, fittingly, the earliest known fragment of Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*, found at Oxyrhynchus (P.Oxy. 405). The marginal markings appear beside Irenaeus' citation of Matthew 3: 16. The second is a fragment of an unidentified theological work (P.Mich. 764[87]), showing two columns of a papyrus roll. The left margin of the right-hand column contains διπλαῖ marking citations of Jer. 18: 3–6 and 1 Cor. 3: 13.[88]

In all the Christian examples so far known, the διπλῆ marks out words which were not merely quotations, but scriptural quotations. And it is significant that our two earliest examples use the διπλῆ not just for OT but for NT texts, in these cases, Matthew and 1 Corinthians.[89] In the fourth century the διπλῆ would be used in the great codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, then also in Bezae of the fifth century, to indicate where NT writers quote the OT.

Where and when did these *diplae sacrae* originate in Christian texts? We do not yet know, but the fact that they occur in two of the very earliest Christian non-biblical papyri extant (though absent in many others) suggests that the

[84] Inowlocki, *Eusebius*, 47; E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Princeton: PUP, 1971), 17.

[85] Inowlocki, *Eusebius*, 47.

[86] For more on these and other texts which use the διπλῆ, including photographs, see C. E. Hill, 'Irenaeus, the Scribes, and the Scriptures: Papyrological and Theological Observations from P.Oxy 3.405', in Sara Parvis and Paul Foster, *Irenaeus and his Traditions* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, forthcoming, 2012).

[87] C. E. Römer, '7.64. Gemeinderbrief, Predict oder Homilie über den Menschen im Angesicht des Jüngsten Gerichts', in C. E. Römer and T. Gagos, eds., *P. Michigan Koenen* (= *P. Mich. Xviii*) (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1996), 35–43.

[88] An image is available online at http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/i/image/getimage-idx?cc=apis&entryid=X-2042&viewid=3689R.TIF&quality=large.

[89] The next case we have is a late 3rd-cent. codex containing two works of Philo (Paris Bib. Nat. P.Gr. 1120), which uses the διπλῆ to mark OT citations.

practice may already have been somewhat widespread at that time, and that it predated these particular manuscripts. Use of the διπλῆ here reflects not only a distinct awareness of citation, but an awareness that what was marked was being set apart as scripture. It is not unlikely that this reflects awareness on the part of the authors of these two treatises, but at least on the part of scribes who penned them, and then, of course, on the part of readers who read them. As readers used such marked texts, this must have had a reflexive influence on writers as well. It is interesting that the advent of this scribal convention denoting scriptural citation awareness in Christian treatises seems to coincide roughly with an observed increase in accuracy in scriptural citation from about the time of Irenaeus. Perhaps this convention itself played a role in changing citation 'standards' (at least of scripture) in Christian works. Use of the διπλῆ (with some variation of form) for marking scriptural quotations never became universal but it did persist throughout the Middle Ages and into the print era. The *siglum* finally evolved into the quotation marks and guillemets which we use today.[90]

CONCLUSIONS

Christian writers inherited from Greco-Roman and from Jewish culture an approach to literary borrowing which did not prize exact replication of the text in the new setting as its chief ideal. According to Inowlocki, 'that which we might consider falsification was viewed by ancient writers as a methodology in explicitating [*sic*] the true, authentic meaning of a text. In a sense, in the ancient author's view, modifying the text cited was meant to express its essence more clearly.'[91]

This means that attempts to extract an underlying text from those who participated in such a literary culture should accept that what appear to be minor additions to the text, minor or major omissions, substitutions of synonymous or interpretive words, variations of word order, adaptations of syntactic or stylistic features to the new literary setting, conflations of parallel materials, and possibly other changes, cannot be assumed to reflect accurately an author's exemplar. The realities of ancient citation practice have implications for the study of the *reception* of biblical writings as well. When encountering what looks like a literary borrowing from a particular source, the presence of such textual discrepancies as just mentioned may not rule out

[90] See M. B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect* (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), 27, 57–61.

[91] Inowlocki, *Eusebius*, 42.

the possibility that it is in fact a borrowing from the said source (even if it also means we cannot be certain about the precise form of the underlying text).[92]

Similarly, the presence of such divergences in quoted material cannot (by itself) translate into the conclusion that actual copies of the texts appropriated were being altered freely in the copying process. Ancient readers of all kinds knew the difference between the sundry ways a text might be appropriated in a new literary setting and the copying of an entire book in an effort to duplicate that book. Moreover, these kinds of modifications in quoted material simply do not, in themselves, offer clear indications that the book quoted was or was not considered sacred.

The observed 'liberties' often taken in the citation process may help explain why statistical comparisons of patristic citations with particular manuscripts, or with other patristic authors, in general show a lower rate of correspondence than one might expect.[93] It is possible too, I would suggest, that this phenomenon might also offer a partial explanation for the oft-mentioned resemblance between the NT text (apparently) used by many of the early patristic writers and what is called the Western text—which is often not seen as a recension but as a tendency in copying. That is, some of the resemblance may be due to similar tendencies without implying anything about the quoting author's exemplar.

Despite the caveats and the complexities involved in the effort, the potential for recovering the reading of an author's NT exemplar from his citations always remains, in some authors more so than in others, and therefore the task must be pursued. Happily, there are some who are pursuing it.

[92] For a discussion of factors for determining use, see Hill, 'Identifying the Use of a Johannine Text', in 'The Orthodox Gospel', 235–42.

[93] As acknowledged e.g. by C. P. Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2008), 309–10.

15

The Text of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers

Paul Foster

INTRODUCTION

Straightaway it needs to be stated that comparing the form of the New Testament text in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers as an indication of the state of that text in the second century is not the same as investigating actual manuscripts of the NT from the second century. The reasons for this are not simply because the writings known collectively as the Apostolic Fathers are not continuous texts of NT writings, nor because they excerpt what are at times very loose citations or allusions—the basic reason is far more fundamental. None of the manuscripts that preserve the writings of the Apostolic Fathers come from the second century, and yet at times there is an almost pre-critical belief that manuscripts often several centuries later than the date of composition of these writings provide pristine access to the state of that author's writing and consequently for the NT text as that author read it in the second century. It is not even the case that the stability of the textual transmission of the texts of the Apostolic Fathers may be a theoretically unverifiable claim. The reality is that even the limited manuscript evidence that attests the transmission of these writings shows that the copying of these documents was at times extremely unstable.

The textual tradition of certain texts in the modern construct which is the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers illustrates the fluidity in transmitting these texts. The writings of Ignatius of Antioch show that not only have the generally accepted seven authentic epistles been expanded to produce the longer recension, but the corpus of seven letters was swollen to perhaps contain thirteen writings by Ignatius (and they are just the Greek writings

associated with his name).[1] Moreover, the earliest Greek witness to his epistles as free-standing documents dates to the eleventh century. Even the lengthy citation of parts of the seven genuine epistles in Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* (written in the fourth century) comes from Greek manuscripts no earlier than the tenth or more likely the eleventh century.[2] So in this case one is actually dealing with eleventh-century manuscripts witnessing to a second-century writing which often loosely cites the text of the NT in the (vain?) hope of trying to glean insights into the state of the text of various NT writings prior to, or contemporary with, the earliest hard evidence of actual texts of these writings. From the outset the potential of this approach to yield decisive results should be judged for what it really is—extremely limited. Rather, at best, the quotations in these writings, if cited accurately rather than loosely, if transmitted faithfully rather than freely, if randomly preserving units of text that are known to preserve variation units that allow a differentiation between text forms, may then at best provide corroborative evidence to supplement observations about the state of the text in the second century. The probability that anything decisive may be adduced is incredibly low.

A further issue is that of determining which writings among the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers should be considered here for investigating the shape of the NT text in the second century. Writings that are usually included in this corpus will be excluded from this analysis on one of either two grounds: if it is questionable whether the writing was written in the second century, or if the writing does not contain at least one reasonably accurate citation of the NT rather than vague and contested allusions. This last criterion is eminently sensible: if there is not even agreement as to whether the NT is being cited, it seems fruitless to consider what form of the text might stand behind such a contested identification. On the first criterion, the question of dating, although the *Epistle of Diognetus* may be correctly dated to the second half of the second century a sufficient number of scholars push the date into the third century (or even later), thus rendering it an uncertain point of reference for discussing the state of the text of the NT in the second century. Moreover, apart from the citation of 1 Cor. 8: 1 in *Ep. Diog.* 12.5 there is little direct and precise use of the text of the NT. Meecham's assessment is as follows:

> Both earlier and later apologists made little direct use of Scripture. In this the *Epistle of Diognetus* is true to type. It gives but one precise citation (xii, 5), the passage (I Cor. viii, I) being ascribed to 'the Apostle'. But we hear abundant echoes, especially of the Pauline writings. Words and phrases from the Corinthian letters in particular are interwoven into the Epistle.[3]

[1] For a discussion of these issues see P. Foster, 'The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch', in P. Foster, ed., *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 81–9.

[2] E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke II, 3: Die Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag GmbH, 1999; orig. 1909), pp. xxvii–xlvii.

[3] H. G. Meecham, *The Epistle to Diognetus* (Manchester: MUP, 1949), 56–7.

It should also be noted that the phrase cited from 1 Cor. 8: 1, ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, ἡ δέ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ, has a relatively stable transmission history with the only variant recording for the Greek manuscript tradition in the NA^{27} apparatus being the insertion of the postpositive conjunction δέ after the first definite article, attested by 𝔓^{46}.

While the remaining writings that constitute the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers are all widely agreed to have been written in the second century, some preserve no precise citation of the NT. Thus the short fragment of the *Apology of Quadratus* preserved in the writings of Eusebius (*HE* 4.3.1–2) preserves no scriptural citation.[4] Similarly, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp,* while very occasionally echoing the language of the Passion narratives or other scriptural passages, offers no direct citations of the NT to establish the form of the text in the second century.[5] Similarly, the Fragments of Papias are most important for the textual evidence they supply about the *pericope adulterae* (John 7: 53–8: 11).[6] However, most textual critics would agree that this was a later addition to John's Gospel. Therefore, the relevant texts to be considered include the *Didache*, *1 Clement*, *2 Clement*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the Epistles of Ignatius, and Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians*.

The approach adopted here is representative rather than an exhaustive treatment of all the explicit citations. However, it is not a random selection. Instead the examples will be chosen with the heuristic purpose of attempting to illustrate whether it is possible to determine with any degree of certainty which specific forms of the text were known to the various authors listed. As a final caveat, it should be stated that the language of text types is used with caution. The current challenge to the whole theory of discrete text types in light of the emerging Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM), at the very least creates a reticence about being overly dogmatic concerning such hermetically sealed families of texts.[7] While the CBGM has identified clusters of related texts, it has also illustrated the very mixed character of certain manuscripts previously identified as being strong representatives of certain text types. For this reason, rather than speak directly about whether the

[4] See P. Foster, 'The Apology of Quadratus', in P. Foster, ed., *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 52–62.

[5] For a more positive assessment of the role of the text of the New Testament in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* see B. Dehandschutter, 'The New Testament and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*', in A. F. Gregory and C. M. Tuckett, eds., *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 395–405.

[6] There are a few other points of contact with the NT text, such as referring to John the son of Zebedee as being surnamed 'son of thunder' (fragment 20, M. W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 3rd edn. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 722–67).

[7] The chief voice questioning the concept of text-types is Holger Strutwolf, although his paper 'Alexandrian, Western, Byzantine? The Theory of Local Text-Types—A Plea for a Paradigm Shift in New Testament Text Research' remains unpubl. For a fuller discussion of these issues see

writing of a certain author is representative of a text type, the more cautious hypothesis will be investigated as to whether particular variant readings characteristically found in certain forms of NT texts align closely with readings witnessed by the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.

CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

The set of writings to be considered is a subset of the larger corpus identified as the Apostolic Fathers. In total there are thirteen texts considered, but the seven Epistles of Ignatius will be evaluated collectively, thus resulting in seven brief sections. Although the dating of these texts is disputed, they will be examined in what may be considered a plausible chronological order (although *2 Clement* will be treated immediately after *1 Clement*). For this discussion nothing hangs on these individual dates. The assumed chronological order is simply employed for taxonomical convenience.

The **Didache**

The parallels to NT texts preserved in the *Didache* raise a number of problems not encountered to the same degree in the other writings under consideration. This is because the author does not simply cite traditions (regardless of how loosely this is done) drawn from the NT, rather the author rewrites those traditions to create a community rule. This means the text of the NT, and in particular Matthew's Gospel, permeates the whole text of the *Didache*, but often in an intentionally reworked form that limits its use for the current project of looking for evidence for the state of the NT text in the second century. Consequently the selection of passages will be limited to those places where more precise parallels exist.

After the opening statement about the Two Ways, the *Didache* illustrates the way of life by first giving a paraphrased version of the two commandments described in Matt. 22: 37–9, followed by a negative form of the golden rule (cf. Matt. 7: 12). As neither of these parallels seeks to offer a citation of the Gospel tradition, and in fact the text is heavily refashioned, these examples cannot be used to determine the form of the source material. By contrast the material in *Didache* 1.3–4 parallels material in the Synoptic Gospels much more closely and is introduced by the formula, *τούτων δὲ τῶν λόγων ἡ διδαχή ἐστιν αὕτη.*

P. Foster, 'Recent Developments and Future Directions in New Testament Textual Criticism: Report on a Conference at the University of Edinburgh, 27 April 2006', *JSNT* 29 (2006): 229–35.

Table 15.1.

Did. 3b	Matt. 5:44	Luke 6:27–8
εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν, προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμᾶς.	*ἐγω δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν ʽκαὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶνʼ διωκόντων ὑμᾶς*	*Ἀλλα ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοῦς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς πονεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.*

On their own these words do not necessitate that the material that follows is a quotation rather than simply an expression of emphasis. However, when the contents are compared to Matt. 5: 44–8//Luke 6: 27–8, 32–3, 45 it is almost certain that the author is drawing upon a pre-existing source of tradition. The difficulty is in determining from which source these traditions come. When the opening clause of the *Didache*'s injunction is set alongside the Lukan and Matthean parallels the difficulty can be readily seen.

Here the opening clause in *Did.* 3b, *εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν*, parallels the first three words of Luke 6: 28, but there is a case difference between the fourth word: *ὑμῖν* in *Did.* 3b, and *ὑμᾶς* in Luke 6: 28 as printed in NA²⁷.[8] However, the following manuscripts of Luke 6: 28 read *ὑμῖν* in agreement with *Did.* 3b: 𝔓⁷⁵ *Λ Δ Θ Ψ pm.*[9] Does this agreement with the reading contained in this cluster of manuscripts reveal anything about the state of the text used by the author of the *Didache*, or more fundamentally about the prevalent text-form of the NT in this variation-unit? Or does it simply represent a change made independently by different authors? Another alternative is that the Didachist knew the Q form which was different from Luke, or that the manuscript of the *Didache* had been conformed to such a reading at a later point in its transmission history. The possibilities could be multiplied further, and perhaps all that should be concluded is that at this point the *Didache* offers secondary support for the variant *ὑμῖν* which has primary support from the Greek manuscripts listed above.

This example is extremely complex, and the evidence is further confused by the fact that certain manuscripts that have been classed as 'Western' preserve a version of Matt. 5: 44 that contains the clause *εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς/ὑμῖν*.[10] Again certainty is impossible, but it may be

[8] Here the printing of NA²⁷ consulted is the 8th corrected printing including papyri 99–116 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001). The papyri that have been publ. since this date (papyri 116–24; www.uni-muenster.de/INTF/) contain no fragments of Matthew or Luke.

[9] Tuckett states 'the *Didache* has an exact parallel to the "bless those who curse you" clause of Luke 6.28a, which has no parallel in (at least the "best" MSS of) Matthew'. C. M. Tuckett, 'The *Didache* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in A. Gregory and C. M. Tuckett, eds., *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 120.

[10] See NA²⁷, Matt. 5: 44 for the most significant witnesses to this variant.

considered more probable that later scribes harmonized the text of Matthew and Luke in certain manuscripts, and the Didachist independently conflated the readings of both Gospels, rather than that the text of the *Didache* attests the early circulation of a type of reading preserved by a cluster of manuscripts that has become known as the 'Western' form of the text.

A second important example is the version of the Lord's Prayer which the *Didache* preserves (*Did.* 8.2//Matt. 6: 5, 9–13//Luke 11: 2–4). Consultation of the three passages will reveal that the form contained in the *Didache* is much more closely aligned to the Matthean version rather than the Lukan.[11] An initial hypothesis that may be entertained is that the author of the *Didache* was drawing directly upon the version of the Lord's Prayer as contained in Matthew. However, consideration of the place of this tradition in the liturgical and worshipping life of the early church problematizes such a facile conclusion. Thus Niederwimmer suggests the Lord's Prayer

> would have been found already in the liturgy that served the Didachist as source, but it is utterly impossible to decide whether the Didachist modified the given wording (perhaps according to the liturgical tradition familiar to him, or according to the wording of a gospel text before him). It is clear only that the text of the prayer as we now have it agrees strongly with the one handed on by Matthew, with some characteristic deviation from the latter. It is hard to suppose that the *Didache* quotes directly from the text of Matthew's Gospel. The agreements would rest on a common liturgical tradition.[12]

Consequently even in this case where there is strong verbal agreement with the form of text preserved in a specific gospel, there is no certainty that the author was quoting directly from the text of Matthew.

It is of course possible to multiply the number of phrases in the *Didache* that parallel material in the Synoptic Gospels, especially the Gospel of Matthew. The author in fact uses the term 'gospel' on several occasions (*Did.* 8.2; 11.3; 15.3, 4) and may do so to refer to a written source (although that is not the only possible explanation). However, the author is not a copyist of Gospel manuscripts, but a creative shaper of early Christian traditions. Hence those traditions are still in a state of flux, and while seen as sources of inspiration they are far from being canonically fixed elements. As Tuckett eloquently states 'the *Didache* is clearly not attempting to produce a scribal copy of the text of any of the gospels. Whoever produced the *Didache* was aiming at a new literary production.'[13] Finally if any further evidence were required concerning

[11] Tuckett observes the following features that demonstrate this: 'the address to God as "Our Father who art in heaven", rather than just as "Father"', the inclusion of the 'Thy will be done ...', as well as the 'deliver us from evil' clause. See 'The *Didache* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', 104 n. 74.

[12] K. Niederwimmer, *The Didache* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 135–6.

[13] Tuckett, 'The *Didache* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', 127.

the difficulty of using the text of the *Didache* as preserved in Codex Hierosolymitanus (H) dated to 1056 CE, it is provided by the small fragmentary text of the *Didache* found in P.Oxy. 1782, dated to the end of the fourth century, which preserves *Did.* 1.3c–1.4a; 2.7b–3.2a. The later complete form of the text shows that some of the gospel parallels have indeed been brought into closer conformity with the form of text known from the Gospels. Thus the eleventh-century manuscript of the *Didache* is not a pristine text of the second-century form of that document. Moreover, even the 'original text' of the *Didache* does not seek to produce a scribal copy of the NT passages it parallels, and the authorial freedom in reshaping gospel traditions means that it cannot be used to determine the form of the Gospel text that may have been before the Didachist, even if he drew directly from the Gospels, and that possibility is itself highly contested.

1 Clement

The document known as *1 Clement* is awash with citations, but the vast majority of these are drawn from the Jewish scriptures rather than from the writings that were to form the NT.[14] Hence, as Hagner notes, '[i]n comparison with the massive use of Old Testament quotation in Clement's epistle, the use of the NT writings is slight'.[15] There are perhaps only two places where anything approaching a precise citation of synoptic material can be detected. These are to be found in *1 Clem.* 13.2 and 46.8. The first example provides the closest parallel.[16]

The seven ethical imperatives that form the list in *1 Clem.* 13.2 are in the majority of cases shorter forms of the tradition known from Matthew and Luke. However, brevity is not necessarily an indication of primitivity. The concern is not to accurately replicate the text of the source, but to produce a memorable form that is faithful to the message of the tradition. The trouble with using this citation as a piece of evidence in pursuit of the form(s) of the text of the NT in the second century is not only the fact that it is a very creative and free-form rendering of the tradition but, more importantly, it is not even possible to state with certainty which gospel Clement was following (if indeed he had only one text in mind), let alone to recover the form of a specific gospel. In relation to the opening clause of *1 Clem.* 13.2, the wording of the text of *1 Clem.* is closer to

14 As Gregory observes, '[a]pproximately one quarter of *1 Clement* is given over to quotations from the Jewish scriptures—about 75 in total'. See A. F. Gregory, '*1 Clement*', in P. Foster, ed., *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 29.

15 D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 135.

16 This is a modified form of the table presented in Hagner's study, omitting the Markan parallels (Mark 11: 25b; 4: 24b). Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 136.

Table 15.2.

1 Clem. 13.2	Matt. 5:7; 6:14; 7:12; 7:1; 7:2b	Luke 6:36, 37c, 31, 38a, 37a, 35c, 38c
ἐλεᾶτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε	*μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται*	*γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.*
ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν	*ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρωποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος*	*ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε*
ὡς ποιεῖτε οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν	*πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖψε αὐτοῖς*	*καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως*
ὡς δίδοτε οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν		*δίδοτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν*
ὡς κρίνετε οὕτως κριθήσεαθε	*μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε.ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε,*	*καὶ μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε.*
ὡς χρηστεύεσθε οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν		*ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς.*
ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἐν αὐτῇ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	*καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.*	*ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.*

Matthew than Luke. With the third clause Matthew and Luke are closer to one another than *1 Clem.* is to either. While with the sixth clause, if there is a parallel to synoptic material, then *1 Clem.* parallels a Lukan tradition for which there is no Matthean parallel.[17] Furthermore, although *1 Clem.* more frequently stands closer in wording to Matthew, the seven imperatives of *1 Clem.* are structurally much more closely connected to Luke where they are contained within the compass of eight consecutive verses, whereas in the Matthean parallels they are spread over three chapters. This may suggest that the arrangement of the material in *1 Clem.* was influenced by the third Gospel, but the wording was shaped by the Matthean form of the tradition.

There is of course a further possibility that throws all such speculation into question. Although some Markan parallels exist for the second and seventh imperatives (Mark 11: 25b and 4: 24b respectively), the traditions which *1 Clem.* replicates are primarily material usually categorized in the synoptic tradition as double tradition, or Q material. While it may not be the most

[17] Hagner labels this sixth imperative (f) and states, 'at least one maxim (f) is completely without parallel in the Synoptics'. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 136. This is probably correct, since the slight verbal affinities with Luke 6: 35c are probably coincidental or at best the faintest of allusions.

likely possibility, one cannot discount the possibility that *1 Clem.* drew upon another source apart from Matthew and Luke.[18] Whether this was Q itself, or some other epitome of these sayings, is impossible to tell (and is, to some extent, irrelevant to the question at hand). However, since it is impossible to determine which gospel account *1 Clem.* quarried for these traditions, it would be extremely foolhardy to conclude anything about the shape of the text of a specific gospel behind this parallel material in *1 Clem.*

Clement's use of the NT epistles is in some ways more straightforward since the problem of parallel versions of the same tradition is rarely present. The relationship between Clement and the Epistle to the Hebrews is not just a modern concern. Writing in the early fourth century Eusebius makes the following observations concerning Clement's use of Hebrews in his own epistle:

> In this [*1 Clem.*] he has many thoughts parallel to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and actually makes some verbal quotations from it showing clearly that it was not a recent production... For Paul had spoken in writing to the Hebrews in their native language, and some say that the evangelist Luke, others that this same Clement translated the writing. And the truth of this would be supported by the similarity of style preserved by the Epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews, and by the little difference between the thoughts in both writings. (*H.E.* 3.38.1–3)

Admittedly, some of Eusebius' assessments seem faulty: Pauline authorship of Hebrews is highly unlikely, as is the notion that canonical Hebrews is a translation of a Hebrew original. Similarly then, suppositions about translators appear to be both incorrect and fruitless. Nonetheless the basic observation concerning close parallels in the thought and wording of certain passages in *1 Clem.* is borne out by comparison of textual units.

Table 15.3.

1 Clem. 36.2	Heb. 1:3–4
ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, τοσούτῳ μείζων ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκεν.	ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ (+ 20 words), τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος °τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ᾽ αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα.

[18] The wider circulation of these traditions has already been seen in relation to the passage used as an example from the *Didache* (1.3b-4a//Luke 6: 27–9, 32–3). Even more significant is the parallel to *1 Clem.* 13.2 found in Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* 2.3 with a series of four brief imperatives:

μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε
ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν
ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε
ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

This suggests that these sayings circulated in various forms, some of which had become independent of the setting of the synoptic gospels.

The first thing to acknowledge is that there is a clear parallel between these two texts. Secondly, however, despite similarity in wording, there are obvious divergences. The omission of the final twenty words from Heb. 1: 3 reveals that that the author of *1 Clem.* is not attempting to make a copy of the text of Hebrews, but rather is using the ideas contained in that epistle to continue his own line of argument as well as employing a familiar text that may be recognized as adding weight to that argument. As Hagner states 'Clement agrees with the opening words of Heb. 1.3 except for the substitution of *μεγαλωσύνης* for *δόξης*.'[19] Since the reading of *μεγαλωσύνης* is not attested in any surviving manuscripts of Hebrews, this is best understood as a variant unique to *1 Clem.* and not of relevance in understanding the transmission history of the text of Hebrews. The one place where the text of *1 Clem.* 36.2 agrees with a known variant in the text of Heb. 1: 4 is the omission of the definite article *τῶν* before *ἀγγέλων*, in agreement with the reading contained in 𝔓[46] and B. However, given the free way that *1 Clem.* rewrites this line and the fluidity of scribal habits surrounding the retention or omission of definite articles, this casts no light on the form of the text familiar to the author.

For the purpose of this study it is not of great importance to explore which NT writings may have been known to the author of *1 Clem.* It is sufficient to give the opinion of Gregory that it 'seems certain on the basis of the internal evidence of his letter that the author of *1 Clement* used 1 Corinthians, and very likely indeed that he used Romans and Hebrews'.[20] Regardless of whether this is seen as a correct assessment or whether one wishes to suggest *1 Clem.* used a larger corpus of writings from the collection that later formed the NT, the freedom with which these texts are used means that these brief snatches of inexact parallels to NT texts cannot be used to conclude anything of great significance about the form of the text known to the author. Rather, this very inexactitude may reveal something about the availability of those texts to the author when composing his own letter and the mechanics of his citation method. It appears that the use of NT allusions was often through memory rather than direct consultation. Therefore, given the vagaries of memory, the brevity of the references or allusions to the writings that later formed the NT, and the freedom that the author of *1 Clem.* exercised in adapting source material for pastoral purposes, it must be acknowledged that the evidence provided by this letter is not of the type that allows determination of the form of the text of the NT that may have been known to this author.

[19] Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments*, 179.

[20] A.F. Gregory, '*1 Clement* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Gregory and Tuckett, *Reception of the New Testament*, 154.

2 Clement

One of the key features of *2 Clement* is that it appears to provide the earliest extant evidence of a Christian author explicitly referring to a passage from the NT as 'scripture'. Having just cited Isa. 54: 1 in a form identical with the text of the LXX (cf. Gal. 4: 27), the author, after explicating this passage, continues the argument at *2 Clem.* 2.8 by saying, *καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει ὅτι Οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς* (cf. Mark 2: 17//Matt. 9: 13). Here the form of the six-word citation is identical with the Markan form, whereas the Matthean form opens with the words *Οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον*... (Matt. 9: 13). While it is possible that the author of *2 Clement* modified the Matthean form, inadvertently making it align with the Markan form, the more plausible explanation is that Mark 2: 17 is being cited. What is the implication of this for investigation of the form of the NT text in the second century? Before answering this question three observations need to be made. First, according to the apparatus of NA^{27} there are no recorded textual variants in this unit.[21] Secondly, our oldest copy of *2 Clement* (1.1–12.5a) is found in the fifth-century codex Alexandrinus. Thirdly, the date of composition is unknown, although those who have ventured an opinion on its date usually place it at any point between the beginning and end of the second century. Holmes perhaps gives the most honest assessment when he states in relation to *2 Clement* that 'virtually nothing is known about its author, date, or occasion'.[22] So on one of the rare occasions when the text of a specific gospel can be identified in the text of the writings of an apostolic father, and even more unusually that it is a Markan text, there is no variation from the uniform and consistent form of this short phrase. It would be too much to conclude that this minute piece of evidence attests the stability of the text in the second century. At best one might suggest that it provides no counter-evidence to that hypothesis, but the evidential base is too slender to reach any meaningful conclusion.

Table 15.4.

2 Clem. 4.2	Matt. 7:21	Luke 6:46
λέγει γάρ οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι Κύριε κύριε, σωθήσεται	*Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοί Κύριε κύριέ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν,*	*Τί δέ με καλεῖτέ Κύριε κύριε,*
ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ δικαιοσύνην.	*ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.*	*καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;*

[21] B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece,* 27th edn., 8th rev. impression (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001), 94.

[22] Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 133.

There are other places where *2 Clement* attributes words to Jesus, and these passages can be seen to have parallels in the canonical accounts. Thus *2 Clem.* 4.2 stands in parallel to a double tradition passage, and the data can be represented as in Table 15.4.

While all three versions share the double vocative address, it is apparent that the introduction to that striking appellation is identical between *2 Clem.* 4.2 and Matt. 7: 21, but that the Luke form differs. Similarly the final line of the form in *2 Clement* closely parallels the Matthean form, while being divergent from the Lukan form. Since there is good reason to suppose that the Lukan form more accurately preserves the underlying Q form, it would appear that *2 Clem.* 4.2 demonstrates knowledge of Matthean redactional activity.[23] Where *2 Clement* deviates from the Matthean form of the tradition—by replacing *εἰσελεύσεται . . . οὐρανῶν*, with *σωθήσεται*, replacing *θέλημα* with *δικαιοσύνην*, and by preserving a shorter form than the Matthean tradition—there are no textual variants in texts of Matthew's Gospel that contain these variants. Moreover, where there are variants in the Matthean text such as the omission of *τοῖς* before the final *οὐρανοῖς* (L W *f* 13 𝔐), and the addition at the end of the verse of the phrase *αὐτὸς εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν* (C2 W *Θ* 33. 1241 *pc* lat syc; Cyp), at these points the shorter version in *2 Clement* does not parallel the Matthean form. Consequently, little can be said about the form of the text used by the author of *2 Clement*. Rather, the evidence permits the conclusion that the version in *2 Clement* appears to reflect a stage of development in the tradition history of this saying that occurs after it had undergone Matthean redactional alteration. However, it is not possible to determine whether this saying was composed by consulting a written text of Matthew's Gospel, or represents a case of citation from memory. Since these prior questions cannot be determined, and also because the tradition is cited in a free form reflecting the author's own creativity, it is impossible to conclude anything definitive about the form of the text which may have been before the author of *2 Clement* either in written form or as a memorized text.

The Shepherd of Hermas

In his classic study of the possible use of the NT by the author of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, Drummond makes the following observations. 'The author of the Shepherd of Hermas nowhere supplies us with direct quotation from the Old or New Testament, and we are therefore obliged to fall back upon allusions

[23] A. F. Gregory and C. M. Tuckett, '*2 Clement* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Gregory and Tuckett, *Reception of the New Testament*, 258–9.

which always admit of some degree of doubt.'[24] In opposition to this, Westcott's earlier published opinion was far more positive concerning dependence upon certain NT writings.

> The allusions to the Epistle of St James and to the Apocalypse are naturally most frequent, since the one is most closely connected to the Shepherd by its tone, and the other by its form. The numerous paraphrases of our Lord's words prove that Hermas was familiar with some records of His teaching. That these were no other than our gospels is at least rendered probable by the fact that he makes no reference to any Apocryphal narrative . . . The relation of Hermas to St Paul is interesting and important. . . . In addition to marked coincidences of language with the First Epistle to the Corinthians and with that to Ephesians, Hermas distinctly recognizes the great truth which is commonly recognized as the characteristic centre of St Paul's teaching.[25]

While the difference of opinion is apparent, both authorities agree that the debate concerns opinions about 'allusions', and that citations or direct quotations do not occur in the long and meandering text of the *Shepherd*. In the most significant recent study of the relationship between the *Shepherd* and the writings that later became the NT, Verheyden makes the cautious suggestion that the material in *Man*. 4 'offers a solid basis for revisiting material that is paralleled in Matthew and in 1 Corinthians'.[26] However, this tentative conclusion is built upon the foundation of his earlier solid observation that 'Hermas does not formally quote from any of these [the writings of the New Testament], and he does not otherwise refer to such writings.'

The consequence of this for the investigation into the forms of the NT text that circulated during the second century is that there is no secure textual witness available through accurately cited passages of the NT that allows for any conclusions to be drawn regarding the form of the text of the NT that may have been know to Hermas. Debate instead continues in relation to the a priori question concerning whether it can be concluded that the *Shepherd* is dependent on the NT even through allusions.

Epistle of Barnabas

By contrast with the *Shepherd*, the *Epistle of Barnabas* potentially offers some basis for making a comparison of texts with possible parallels in the NT. However, as will be seen, once again there is no secure basis for establishing

[24] J. Dummond, 'Shepherd of Hermas', in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 105.

[25] B. F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (Cambridge and London: Macmillan, 1855), 223–4; 5th rev. edn. (1881), 201–2.

[26] J. Verheyden, 'The *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Gregory and Tuckett, *Reception of the New Testament*, 329.

Table 15.5.

Barn. 4.14	Matt 22:14
προσέχωμεν, μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλιγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὑρεθῶμεν.	πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλιγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

any firm conclusions about the form of the text of the NT in the second century. Carleton-Paget helpfully notes the difference in the author's practice when citing the OT, and the way passages that have been identified as possible NT parallels are deployed within the text of *Barnabas*. Thus he observes, '*Barnabas* is much concerned with direct citation of what Christians came to call the Old Testament . . . With a variety of introductory formulae, he cites from a broad swathe of OT books, with varying degrees of accuracy, and usually quoting from what appears to be a Greek *Vorlage*.'[27] By contrast, putative NT allusions or citations are given without citation formulae, except in one possible case which requires consideration.

The hortatory injunction in *Barn*. 4.14 exhorts the audience to strive to 'be chosen'. The contrast between 'many called' and 'few chosen' is reminiscent of the tradition in Matt. 22: 14, and more significantly appears to be introduced with an intentional citation formula ὡς γέγραπται. In full the parallel is shown in Table 15.5.

While other possibilities have been suggested for the parallel displayed here, such as dependence on certain passages in 4 Ezra (8.3; 9.15),[28] or citation of an unknown apocalypse,[29] or even that the author had mistakenly attributed the saying to the Old Testament, such explanations are unconvincing. As Carleton-Paget notes, 'in spite of all these arguments, it still remains the case that the closest existing text to *Barn*. 4.14 in all known literature is Matt. 22.14, and one senses that attempts to argue for independence from Matthew are motivated by a desire to avoid the implication of the *formula citandi* which introduces relevant words: namely, that the author of *Barnabas* regarded Matthew as scriptural'.[30] Therefore, accepting the hypothesis that *Barn*. 4.14 is intentionally citing Matt. 22: 14, attention can be given to examining any clues about the form of the text known to the author of *Barnabas*.

[27] J. Carleton-Paget, 'The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Gregory and Tuckett, *Reception of the New Testament*, 229.

[28] The parallels with the passages in 4 Ezra are noticeably more distant: 4 Ezra 8.3 'Many are created but few are saved'; 4 Ezra 9.15 'More are of the lost than of the redeemed.'

[29] See H. Windisch, 'Der Barnabasbrief', in *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1920), 318. For more details see Carleton-Paget, 'The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', 232 n. 13.

[30] Carleton-Paget, 'The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', 233.

The text of Matt. 22:14 is relatively stable. The NA[27] presents the text as follows: *πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν* ⸆*κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ* ⸆*ἐκλεκτοί*, with the insertion marks evidencing that the nominative plural definite article *οἱ* is inserted at both places by the following manuscripts: L *f*[1] 700. 892 *pc* sa. The fact that *Barnabas* does not witness this variant perhaps suggests only that this stylistic improvement was introduced after the second century. More significant, however, are the independent deviations from the text of Matt. 22: 14 exhibited by *Barnabas*. Because the citation from Matthew is being used for the purpose of exhortation, the author recasts the phraseology to suit his purpose with the insertion of the sermonic hortatory subjunctives *προσέχωμεν* and *εὑρεθῶμεν*. Moreover, he freely deletes the conjunction and the verb (*γάρ, εἰσιν*) from the Matthean form. This free attitude towards accuracy in citations illustrates the difficulty of using *Barnabas* to establish the underlying form of the NT text known to the author.

The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch

When considering the form of the NT text that may have been known to Ignatius as reflected in his seven genuine epistles,[31] it is necessary to bear in mind the physical circumstances surrounding the composition of those letters and the resources which may, or more likely may not, have been at his disposal. The seven letters represent an extremely concentrated and creative burst of literary activity during what must have been an emotionally and spiritually highly charged period in the life of Ignatius. The testimony of the letters reveals that they were written while Ignatius was being transported to Rome for execution. Given both the elements of travel and incarceration it is perhaps unlikely that Ignatius or his travelling companions were travelling with an extensive library of texts. What is surprising is that, despite these circumstances, Ignatius cites various NT writings with a high degree of accuracy. The NT writings that the epistles of Ignatius can be shown to cite with a high degree of probability are the Gospel of Matthew, and four of Paul's epistles—1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and 1 and 2 Timothy.[32]

Since the partial citations from Matthew's Gospel provide no secure base for establishing the form of the text used by Ignatius, attention will be focused on

[31] For a recent discussion outlining the arguments in favour of the authenticity of the seven letter corpus of the so-called middle recension see Foster, 'The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch', 81–107; esp. 81–4.

[32] The case for dependence upon this collection of texts is presented in P. Foster, 'The Epistles of Ignatius and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Gregory and Tuckett, *The Reception of the New Testament*, 159–86; Foster, 'The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch', 103–6.

Table 15.6.

I.Eph. 16.1	1 Cor 6:9–10
μὴ πλανᾶσθε ἀδελφοί μου· οἱ οἰκοφθόροι βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν.	*Ἠοὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἄδικοι θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν; μὴ πλανᾶσθε· οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε εἰδωλολάτραι οὔτε μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται οὔτε κλέπται οὔτε πλεονέκται, οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐ λοίδοροι, οὐχ ἅρπαγες βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν.*

his citation of material from 1 Corinthians, the text he cites with the highest level of verbatim agreement. Three examples will suffice. First in Ignatius' *Ephesians* 16.1, he offers an abbreviated paraphrased citation of 1 Cor. 6: 9–10.

Here there are six shared words, the phrase *μὴ πλανᾶσθε* as well as *βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν*, although the syntactical arrangement differs. It is equally important to note the divergences which most significantly involve the omission of the catalogue of categories of people who will not inherit the kingdom. Furthermore the initial description in 1 Cor. 6: 9 of the anarthrous *ἄδικοι* is replaced by Ignatius' term *οἱ οἰκοφθόροι*. The latter term being a more specific reference to those who corrupt families or households. It is impossible to know whether this change was due to a slip of memory, or intentional either as reflecting a problem confronting Ignatius' own ecclesial context or even influenced by the rhetoric of 2 Tim. 3: 6. Either way, the degree of textual modification does not permit any strong conclusion to be drawn about the specific form of the text that is being used by Ignatius. Moreover, while there are textual variants in the text of the NT in the catalogue of v. 10, these are not only insignificant but are unparalleled by the passage from *I.Eph.* 16.1.

The second example has the further complication that the citation of 1 Cor. 1: 18, 20 which occurs in *I.Eph.* 18.1, is itself a citation of Isa. 33: 18, and it is possible to envisage a secondary influencing tendency to conform the NT citation to the OT wording if that were prominent in the author's mind. However, the reference to the 'cross' in *I.Eph.* 18.1, along with its contrasting significance for 'unbelievers' and the 'us' group, shows that the wider context depicted in 1 Cor. 1: 18 was in the mind of Ignatius and thus the source of the second half of *I.Eph.* 18.1 is almost certainly the material in 1 Corinthians and not a parallel taken from Isaiah. Moreover, the term *σκάνδαλον* also occurs in the same context in Paul's letter to the Corinthians, *Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον* (1 Cor. 1: 23).[33] Thus, there is an inexact quotation of material from 1 Corinthians, probably reflecting the fact that while being transported in Roman custody Ignatius did not have access to a copy of 1 Corinthians. Nonetheless,

[33] As Schoedel observes, 'The decisive elements in 18.1 . . . are directly based on 1 Cor 1:19, 20, 23 (with an echo perhaps of Rom 3:27, "where is the boasting?")', *Ignatius of Antioch*, 84.

Table 15.7.

I.Magn 10.2[a]	1 Cor. 5:7–8
ὑπερθεσθε οὖν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην τὴν παλαιωθεῖσαν καὶ ἐνοξίσασαν καὶ μεταβάλεσθε εἰς νέαν ζύμην, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.	*ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην, ἵνα ἦτε νέον φύραμα, καθὼς ἐστε ἄζυμοι· καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός . . . μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας*

[a] Inge cites this text as Magn. x. 3. ('Ignatius', 65), but it is actually 10.2 as given above.

he knew its contents well enough to paraphrase the epistle at certain points, at times with quite a high correspondence with its actual vocabulary.[34]

The third example shows the way in which a striking Pauline metaphor has remained in the mind of Ignatius. Moreover, he has recalled some of the specific language of 1 Cor. 5: 7–8, but his loose citation has reconfigured both the wording and syntactical structure of the passage which he is freely quoting.

In 1 Cor. 5: 8 Paul adjusts the metaphor slightly and describes the leaven as *ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας*, which in regard to the first adjective gives a verbal match to Ignatius' phrase *τὴν κακὴν ζύμην*. Schoedel correctly sees both vv. 7–8 forming the parallel that is behind *I.Magn* 10.2 (*contra* Inge), however, Schoedel's reference to Gal. 5: 9, *μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ*, is dubious.[35] Rather, the use of the leaven metaphor in Gal. 5: 9 is due to Paul applying similar language in another context and not a reflection of Ignatius drawing this language from two separate Pauline Epistles.[36] Here again Ignatius presents a loose citation of a passage from 1 Corinthians with strong conceptual and terminological points of contact.

In summary, the epistles of Ignatius offer proof of the author's knowledge of certain NT writings. However, the freedom with which he quotes those writings means that such examples reveal nothing of probative significance for determining the form of the NT text which might form the basis of those citations.[37]

[34] Lightfoot's conclusion is essentially the same. Commenting on the second half of *I.Eph.* 1.18 he states, 'An inexact quotation from I Cor. I. 20 *ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεύς; ποῦ συζητητὴς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*; which words themselves are a free paraphrase of Isaiah xxxiii. 18' (*The Apostolic Fathers: Part 2, Ignatius and Polycarp,* ii. 74).

[35] In fairness it must be said that Schoedel does not state that Gal. 5: 9 is a parallel or source for the imagery employed by Ignatius, but he does list it alongside 1 Cor. 5: 7–8 without any qualification. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 126.

[36] Lightfoot implies that Gal. 5: 9 has no direct impact on Ignatius' thought at this junction. He simply notes, 'On the metaphor [leaven] generally see note *Galatians* 5.9' (*The Apostolic Fathers: Part 2, Ignatius and Polycarp,* ii. 133).

[37] The discussion of these three examples is dependent on earlier published work contained in P. Foster, 'The Epistles of Ignatius and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', 159–86.

Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians

The text of Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* is in a poor state of preservation. It is worth quoting Holmes's assessment of the state of the textual witnesses.

> Nine late Greek manuscripts are extant, all incomplete and derived from the same defective source, in which 9.2 (through *καὶ δι' ὑμᾶς ὑπό*) is immediately followed by the likewise incomplete text of *The Epistle of Barnabas*, beginning at 5.7 (*τὸν λαὸν τὸν καινόν*). Eusebius has preserved all of chapter 9 and all but the last crucial sentence of chapter 13. For the rest of the letter we are dependent on a Latin translation, preserved in nine manuscripts. It is based on a Greek text older than the one represented in the surviving Greek manuscripts and is generally reliable. There are also some scattered Syriac patristic quotations, which include parts of chapter 12.[38]

The investigation of the forms of the Greek text that circulated in the second century must be limited to the extant Greek witnesses to this text. While it may be possible to reconstruct the Greek behind the Latin or Syriac witnesses, this introduces a level of uncertainty into the investigation which would leave any conclusions based on such data open to obvious and understandable challenge. Given this limitation, one must focus upon the surviving Greek manuscripts of the letter. From this evidence it becomes apparent that Polycarp was familiar with certain NT traditions (regardless of how these were mediated to him) and these potentially might shed some light on the form of the text behind those shared traditions.

Two passages from Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* have strong verbal affinities with two NT epistles. The first parallels a statement in the Pauline Corpus and the second parallels material from 1 Peter. With the parallel between Polycarp *Phil.* 5.3[39] and 1 Cor. 6: 9, there can be little doubt that in some way Polycarp is dependent upon the Pauline list of those excluded from the kingdom. However, it cannot be determined whether Polycarp cites directly from a written source and intentionally abbreviates 1 Cor. 6: 9 reducing its sevenfold vice list to three elements, whether he cites from memory and reproduced only those elements he recalled, or if the tradition has been mediated through another source (the same text is cited in *I.Eph.* 16.1 although in yet another form). However, the freedom in citation again means the text cannot be used to conclude anything about the actual form of the NT text that may stand behind the citation.

The second passage to be considered is from 1 Peter, a writing which Benecke considered 'almost certainly presupposed by Polycarp'.[40]

[38] Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 277.

[39] The text reads, *οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενκοῖται βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν, οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα*. (*Phil.* 5.3).

[40] P. V. M. Benecke, 'The Epistle of Polycarp', in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 86.

Table 15.8.

Phil. 1.3	1 Pet. 1:8
εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ.	*ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ.*

Three authorial activities can be detected in the recasting of the tradition utilized from 1 Pet. 1: 8. First, insertion of the preposition *εἰς* to introduce the saying, secondly, replacement of the verb *ἀγαπᾶτε* with *πιστεύετε*,[41] and thirdly, the omission of the central section of 1 Pet. 1: 8. While the striking similarities between the two passages support Benecke's opinion that 1 Peter was a text known and used by Polycarp, the author's freedom in recasting the text again means that this loose citation cannot be used to conclude anything definitive about the form of the NT text which was known to Polycarp.[42]

CONCLUSIONS

Given the citation techniques employed by the various Apostolic Fathers considered here, it is unsurprising that the loose 'citations' of the NT text that have been detected provide no conclusive evidence for identifying the forms of the text of the NT which may have been in circulation in the second century. Yet, even if the texts had revealed any features that appeared to align with a certain text type, drawing conclusions about the state of the text in the second century would be potentially naïve. This is because the findings would not be based on manuscripts from the second century, but on manuscripts of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers that at the earliest are dated to the fourth century, but stretch down as far as the late medieval and early modern period. It is possible that later scribes involved in copying the writings of the Apostolic Fathers brought the NT material preserved by these authors into line with the form of text that was familiar to the scribes in their own contemporary period. Finally, the whole notion of text types is undergoing radical revision among certain textual critics. This problematizes the whole endeavour of seeking to

[41] For the debate on whether the finite verbs in 1 Pet 1.8 (*ἀγαπᾶτε* and *ἀγαλλιᾶσθε*) and by implication *πιστεύετε* in *Phil.* 1.3 are to be understood as indicatives or imperatives, see the discussions in the standard commentaries, e.g. P. J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 103.

[42] 'The circumstance that the combination of *χαρά*, *ἀνεκλάλητος*, and *δοξάζω* apparently occurs only in *Philippians* and 1 Peter in extant Greek literature of centuries 200 BCE–300 CE considerably increases the probability that Polycarp is here dependent on 1 Peter.' See M. W. Holmes, 'Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Gregory and Tuckett, *Reception of the New Testament*, 220 and n. 146.

establish evidence for the existence of text types in the second century. At best, potentially, if the Apostolic Fathers cited texts accurately, and these references to the NT have been transmitted accurately, then such material may provide wider evidence for individual variants. However, without lengthy continuous excerpts from the writings that later formed the NT, generalized conclusion about textual forms are highly speculative and have a slender evidential base.

The quest for establishing the form of the text of the NT in the second century can only be securely undertaken on the basis of continuous texts of the NT writings that date to the second century itself.[43] There is a paucity of evidence of this type available, with only $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ preserving a significant amount of text which might allow for firm trends to be observed.[44] The other potentially relevant type of evidence would be either lectionaries or commentaries on a continuous text. However, no evidence of this type exists for the second century. The reality is that at this time the form of the text in the second century is a scholarly reconstruction based on firm scientific principles, but not yet corroborated to any large degree by concrete manuscript support. The writings of the Apostolic Fathers get us no closer to reconstructing that text than the actual extant manuscripts of the third and fourth centuries. In fact, the complications surrounding NT citations in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers may in fact confuse rather than clarify this endeavour.

[43] The manuscripts that fall into this class are probably only the following: $\mathfrak{P}^{32}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{52}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{64} + {}^{67}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{90}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{98}$(?) $\mathfrak{P}^{104}$. Of these only $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ preserve a significant amount of text which might allow for firm trends to be observed. However, the limiting fact with these two texts is that they are both assigned a date of *c.*200 by NA^{27}, and may actually be early 3rd-cent. rather than late 2nd-cent. texts. Consequently, the shape of the text of the NT in the 2nd cent. remains conjectural, although it should be acknowledged that the advances in the scientific practice of textual criticism give a strong degree of confidence that an Ausgangstext for the NT can be reconstructed that may reflect the state of the text in the middle of the 2nd cent. if not earlier.

[44] There have been suggestions that $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ may be as early as the 2nd cent., but here the dating presented in NA^{27} and representing the majority scholarly position of a 3rd-cent. date is adopted.

16

Marcion and the Early New Testament Text

Dieter T. Roth

INTRODUCTION

Any serious consideration of the early text of the NT must, at some point, interact with Marcion and the scriptures utilized in his church, for Marcion's scriptures—one Gospel and ten Pauline letters—are widely recognized as early and important textual witnesses.[1] The importance of Marcion's Gospel lies not only in the fact that it reflects a Gospel text extant prior to the middle of the second century, but also due to its clear relationship to the Gospel according to Luke.[2] Thus, regardless of whether Marcion's Gospel was an earlier form of

[1] Numerous scholars have commented on the importance of Marcion's scriptures for NT textual criticism, and several have expressed closer study and new reconstructions of these texts to be scholarly *desiderata*. See e.g. B. Aland, 'Marcion *(ca. 85–160)*/Marcioniten', *TRE* 22/1 (1992): 90; K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 172; K. Beyschlag, 'Marcion von Sinope', in M. Greschat, ed., *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte*, i. *Alte Kirche I* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984), 71; F. Bovon, 'Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect', *HTR* 85 (1992): 176–7; J. K. Elliott, 'The New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Challenge for the Twenty-First Century', *NTTRU* 8 (2000): 12; M. Hengel, 'Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft', *NTS* 40 (1994): 341–2; and G. Quispel, 'Marcion and the Text of the New Testament', *VC* 52 (1998): 349.

[2] The precise nature of the relationship between Marcion's Gospel and Luke is one that has been debated vigorously in the history of research on Marcion's Gospel. For an overview of this debate, including recent misunderstandings of previously held positions, see D. T. Roth, 'Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate', *JBL* 127 (2008): 513–27. A variety of current issues in the study of Marcion's Gospel are discussed in D. T. Roth, 'Marcion's Gospel: Relevance, Contested Issues, and Reconstruction', *ExpTim* 121 (2010): 287–94; id., 'Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion's Gospel?', *VC* 63 (2009): 429–67; and id., 'Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*', *JTS* 59 (2008): 580–97.

Luke or whether it was an edited version of the third canonical Gospel, it sheds light on early readings in the textual history of Luke.[3] Similarly, since Marcion utilized copies of Pauline Epistles, likely already extant in a ten-letter collection,[4] from this same early era, insight into Marcion's scriptures provides at least some level of access to the form of the NT text prior to that in the oldest extant manuscripts.

At the same time, it must be admitted that there is a significant challenge to analyzing Marcion's texts, namely, that since no manuscripts of Marcion's scriptures have survived, the only access to his text is through the testimony of the highly polemical writings of his opponents.[5] Recent studies and reconstructions of Marcion's biblical texts have revealed that the standard, but rather 'maximalist', presentation of Marcion's scriptures in Adolf von Harnack's monumental work on Marcion often offers imprecise and problematic readings for Marcion's *Apostolikon* and *Euangelion*.[6] Though Harnack's work in many ways remains important, this brief chapter will consider a few insights that the most recent work on the 'two halves' of Marcion's canon has contributed to the question of the early text of the NT.

[3] For a recent defence of the view that Marcion created his Gospel by editing canonical Luke, see S. Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 89–102.

[4] Referring to the major study by U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), Judith Lieu comments, 'recent discussion lends support to the position that Marcion received a Pauline corpus of ten letters' ('"As Much My Apostle as Christ is Mine": The Dispute over Paul between Tertullian and Marcion', *Early Christianity,* 1 (2010): 43). See also H. Y. Gamble, 'Marcion and the "Canon"', in M. M. Mitchell and F. M. Young, eds., *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, i. *Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 208–10. For a few references to the arrangement of the Pauline letters in Marcion's collection also being known and used elsewhere, see Quispel, 'Marcion and the Text of the New Testament', 353–5.

[5] Claire Clivaz has cautiously suggested that $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$ could be read as a fragment of Marcion's redaction of Luke ('The Angel and the Sweat like "Drops of Blood" (Lk 22: 43–44): $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$ and f^{13}', *HTR* 98 (2005): 429–32); however, the fact that her suggestion rests entirely on an argument from silence involving verses that are unattested in the sources for Marcion's Gospel renders it methodologically problematic.

[6] See A. von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 2nd edn. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924), esp. 40^{*}–255^{*}. In addition to comments found in the literature cited in n. 1, extensive interaction with Harnack can be found in Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* and D. T. Roth, 'Towards a New Reconstruction of the Text of Marcion's Gospel: History of Research, Sources, Methodology, and the Testimony of Tertullian' (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 2009). These latter two studies, in addition to incorporating advances in textual criticism and patristic studies since Harnack's work, place a particular emphasis on offering new and vital methodological considerations for reconstructing Marcion's texts. These include: (1) the refusal to invoke Marcion's supposed theological proclivities in textual reconstruction, (2) rejecting arguments from silence, and (3) seeking to analyze the evidence found in the sources for readings in Marcion's scriptures based on an analysis and understanding of how the citation customs of a given source may have impacted his testimony.

MARCION'S *APOSTOLIKON*

One of several valuable contributions found in Ulrich Schmid's 1995 monograph *Marcion und sein Apostolos* is a new reconstruction of Marcion's *Apostolikon* that advances significantly beyond previous presentations of Marcion's Pauline letter collection.[7] Though Marcion clearly altered the text of the Pauline epistles for use in his church, Heikki Räisänen is right in observing that recent research 'is inclined to assume that Marcion handled his texts in a more conservative way than has generally been thought'.[8] As interesting as the demonstrably intentional alterations are for the history of the Marcionite movement, Schmid shows that nearly all the omissions and potential changes in Marcion's text do not present a clear redactional agenda 'und sind in ihrer Zufälligkeit am besten mit den gelengentlich sehr kühnen Emendationen in einem Teil der frühen Überlieferung (z.B. 𝔓[46]) zu vergleichen'.[9] Thus, it can already be indicated at the outset that Marcion's *Apostolikon* does not represent a massively emended text, but rather offers a text not dissimilar to other early witnesses to the Pauline Epistles.[10] Of particular interest for the present examination is the attestation of a few specific readings in Marcion's copies of these epistles and what they can tell us about the early text of the NT.[11]

[7] The only major interaction with Marcion's *Apostolikon* between the work of Harnack and Schmid is J. J. Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989). This work, despite some helpful contributions, is ultimately inadequate due to its decision not to consider 2 Corinthians and Romans, its incomplete consideration of the evidence for the letters it does examine, and lingering methodological weaknesses (see Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* esp. 17–23).

[8] H. Räisänen, 'Marcion', in A. Marjanen and P. Luomanen, eds., *A Companion to Second-Century Heretics* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2005), 114.

[9] Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 282 (see also Räisänen, 'Marcion', 114–15). Schmid discusses omissions and possible alterations by Marcion in *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 248–54. According to Schmid's analysis, the only certain textual alterations by Marcion on the basis of the extant evidence are omissions, and it is only in Galatians, Romans, and Colossians where more extensive omissions are found. Schmid also observes that these omissions can generally be demonstrated specifically 'zu den Stichworten "Abraham" und "Israel" sowie zum Gericht nach den Werken und zur Schöpfungsmittlerschaft Christi' (ibid. 254–5).

[10] Gamble presents a similar view: 'Apart from excisions that can be traced specifically to Marcion, the texts he employed did not differ essentially from an early second-century form of the textual tradition of Paul's letters' ('Marcion and the "Canon" ', 211).

[11] Although the ensuing discussion focuses on readings in Marcion's *Apostolikon,* it is important to note that these readings were likely found in an already extant Pauline letter collection in the order Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans (with 14 chapters), 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans (= Ephesians), Colossians, Philippians, with Philemon either preceding or following Philippians. See n. 4 above, n. 21 below, and Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 284–98. In a personal email dated 29 Sept. 2010, Schmid expressed the view that he considers his conclusion that Marcion utilized an already extant Pauline letter collection as almost more important than the textual affinities of readings found in Marcion's *Apostolikon* precisely because the textual history of the Pauline epistles cannot be explained apart from an understanding of the early Pauline letter collections.

First, it is striking that relatively few singular readings that cannot be located within the extant textual tradition of the Pauline Epistles as presently known are found in Marcion's *Apostolikon*.[12] Despite the fragmentary preservation of Marcion's text in the sources, Schmid was able to identify 155 secure readings for Marcion's *Apostolikon* where our present knowledge of the textual tradition reveals differences in reading and Marcion's text can clearly be classified within one of these variant traditions.[13] Thus, it could be said that the close study and reconstruction of Marcion's Pauline letters has led to an overall result that is somewhat similar to that found in the study of the papyri, namely, as Bart Ehrman puts it, 'the remarkable circumstance that in virtually no instance has the discovery of a new papyrus provided us with a reading that was altogether unknown from already available evidence'.[14] At the same time, however, as will be seen below, a singular reading in Gal. 5: 14 of Marcion's text is highly significant for the insight it provides into the textual history of this verse.

Second, based on a careful analysis of the attested elements for Marcion's text in Ephesians (= Laodiceans in Marcion's letter collection), Schmid demonstrated that an early stratum of the 'Western' text is reflected by Marcion's *Apostolikon*.[15] Of particular importance here are the genealogically significant readings shared by 'Western' witnesses and Marcion in Eph. 2: 11 (*μνημονεύοντες* instead of *μνημονεύετε ὅτι*) and Eph. 5: 28.[16] On the other hand, in Eph. 2: 12, 16, 20; and 3: 9, Marcion does not share the reading of the 'Western' witnesses. In addition, though Marcion in other verses in Ephesians often offers a *shorter* reading than that found in other witnesses, which, though characteristic for a

[12] Out of 182 secure readings, Schmid identifies 27 such readings (*Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 261). Of these 27 readings, 14 involve omissions so that it is in only 13 instances that a variant reading is attested for a verse present in Marcion's Pauline letter collection that cannot be located within the extant textual tradition.

[13] See Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 261–2, 345–53.

[14] B. D. Ehrman, 'The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century', in D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, eds., *Codex Bezae* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 100. This, of course, does not mean that there are *no* previously unknown readings in the papyri, nor does it negate the observation that some papyri reveal a comparatively higher number of singular readings than in the later textual transmission (see Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 273, with reference to the views of Ernest C. Colwell).

[15] On the challenges of the term 'Western' text, see the comments below under the heading 'Marcion's *Euangelion*' and n. 25. For the challenges facing the term 'text type' in general see the comments by D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 171–4. Though the term is retained here for convenience, in recognition of the difficulties associated with it, 'Western' always appears in quotation marks. On the importance of variant readings that may not be statistically significant in terms of a text-type analysis but nevertheless have to be understood as genealogically related see Ehrman, 'Text of the Gospels', 101–2.

[16] On the challenges of unravelling the textual history of the various readings attested for this verse see Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 144–8.

manuscript like 𝔓[46] is not usually associated with the 'Western' text, when one considers the twelve glosses found in Marcion's *Apostolikon* in Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, and 1 Thessalonians, there is evidence of readings that are *typical* for 'Western' witnesses.[17] That Marcion's text, nevertheless, is a 'pre-Western' witness is seen most clearly in the singular reading in Gal. 5: 14 mentioned above. Here Marcion's text is the only witness for the reading ἐν ὑμῖν, whereas ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ is attested by witnesses such as P[46], ℵ, A, B, 𝔐, and sy[p]. The reading ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ, found in the 'Western' witnesses D*, F, G, ar, b, and Ambrosiaster, is clearly the result of the combination of the other two readings.[18] The various phenomena attested for Marcion's text of the Pauline epistles leads Schmid to the conclusion that the text of Marcion's *Apostolikon* is a witness for a text form common to Marcion, the 'Western' text, and the (an) old-Syriac text.[19]

At this point it may be observed that even as Marcion's *Apostolikon* provides important insight into the early text of the NT for the Pauline letters, his epistles, to the extent that they can be reconstructed, are not full of unique readings nor are they texts that cannot in any way be located in the extant textual tradition.[20] Rather, in many instances, readings found in Marcion's text shed additional light on the extant textual tradition and offer an important window on key elements of the textual history of several Pauline Epistles.[21]

[17] This remains true even if specific glosses in Marcion's text are not attested in 'Western' witnesses. For Schmid's discussion of all these points see *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 274–9.

[18] Schmid's discussion of this verse is found in *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 130–1, 182, 261 n. 55, and 281. Quispel similarly refers to Marcion's text as a 'pre-Western' text ('Marcion and the Text of the New Testament', 351).

[19] See Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 280. Gamble summarizes that Clabeaux and Schmid 'have demonstrated that Marcion's text was a representative form of an early (pre-140), widely current but largely uncontrolled recension of the Pauline corpus that is also reflected mainly by the Old Latin (especially the "I" type) and the old Syriac traditions' ('Marcion and the "Canon"', 210). This summary is somewhat problematic, however, in that the view of the affinity to the 'I' text was clearly expressed by Clabeaux (*Lost Edition,* 129) but rather strongly questioned by Schmid: 'Insbesondere scheint mir die große Nähe des marcionitischen Textes zu lat I eine künstlich hergestellte Nähe zu sein' (*Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 269–70).

[20] It would certainly be worth undertaking a complete analysis of the other epistles in Marcion's collection in order to determine to what extent the results of the analysis of Ephesians hold true in other epistles. Quispel e.g. discusses the possibility that the 'Western' reading in Gal. 2: 9, found in Marcion's text, where Peter is placed at the head of the list of names rather than following James, is simply an instance where Marcion is passing on a variant reading found at that time in Rome ('Marcion and the Text of the New Testament', 352). Also worth pursuing further are comments made by G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (Oxford: OUP, 1953), 226–41.

[21] Again, it is worth noting that these readings are not unrelated to the question of the forms of early Pauline letter collections because it is precisely in the Latin and Syriac textual tradition, with which Marcion's text has affinities in readings, that the ten-letter collection in the order and shape found in Marcion's *Apostolikon* is attested (see Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos,* 286–9).

MARCION'S *EUANGELION*

Marcion's Gospel, though unfortunately not yet available in its entirety in a new reconstruction, offers a glimpse into the early text of Luke (or, in the view of a few scholars, some type of earlier version of canonical Luke). Since the entirety of Tertullian's testimony to Marcion's Gospel was analyzed in my recently completed doctoral dissertation, the following discussion of specific readings will focus largely, though not exclusively, on insight that can be gained through Tertullian's interaction with Marcion's Gospel.[22]

Consideration of Marcion's Gospel has often included attempts to identify the text type or the textual affinities of his Gospel. Though space does not permit a full discussion, some consideration of this issue is helpful for understanding the nature of the early NT text for which Marcion is a witness. Perhaps unsurprisingly, opinion on this matter has been quite varied, if not diametrically opposed, as Harnack, for example, concluded that Marcion's Gospel was, apart from the tendentious alterations, 'ein reiner W [Western] Text'[23] whereas Barbara Aland more recently stated: 'Certainly the basic text was not the "Western".'[24] Of course, part of the challenge with such statements is the difficulty of the term 'Western' text and what exactly is signified by it;[25] however, there is a growing consensus that, although Marcion emended his Gospel text, the fact that several variants are also attested in 'Western' witnesses more likely makes them early variants than originally Marcionite readings that have crept into a larger textual tradition.[26] A few examples serve to highlight the fact that Marcion's Gospel certainly is not the same as

[22] Tertullian is our most important source for Marcion's Gospel, notwithstanding the views of some scholars up to the early 19th cent. (see Roth, 'Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations', 580, 580 n. 1). Of all the verses attested as present in Marcion's Gospel text, Tertullian attests 90% of them and is the sole witness for 67% of them. I have reconstructed the 328 verses for which Tertullian is the only witness (see Roth, 'Towards a New Reconstruction', 257–73), and am presently analyzing the other sources for Marcion's Gospel in order to publish a complete, new reconstruction of the text.

[23] Harnack, *Marcion*, 242*.

[24] B. Aland, 'Marcion-Marcionites-Marcionism', in *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino, tr. Adrian Walford (2 vols. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1992), i. 523.

[25] See e.g. the discussion of E. J. Epp concerning the Alands' views on the 'Western' text in 'The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission', in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 293 n. 42; previously published in William L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 98 n.77. See also J. N. Birdsall, 'The Western Text in the Second Century', ibid. 3–17.

[26] See also Gamble, 'Marcion and the "Canon"', 206. Though Parker surmises that 'there can be little doubt that his [Marcion's] drastic revision had an unsettling influence on the text [of Luke]', he also notes that 'direct influence is found but rarely' (*The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 148).

the 'D-text', though, as was the case with his Pauline Epistles, may represent a precursor in the process of the development of such a text.

On the one hand, there are clear points of contact with 'Western' readings, with a prominent example being found in Luke 11: 38. This verse is attested only by Tertullian (*Marc.* 4.27.2), where his allusion reveals that the Pharisee *ἤρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διά τι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη*. Though the precise wording and word order cannot be established with certainty, Tertullian does attest a reading similar to the ones found in D, OL manuscripts, the Vulgate, and sy^{c}.[27] A few other instances where there are interesting points of contact between Marcion's text and 'Western' witnesses, though with varying degrees of significance, can also be listed here. In Luke 5: 14 both Tertullian (*Marc.* 4.9.10) and Epiphanius (*Pan.* 42.11.6, [*σχ.* 1]) indicate that Marcion had points of contact with the reading in D and OL manuscripts. In 5: 24, Tertullian (*Marc.* 4.10.1) indicates that Marcion's text read *κράβαττον* with D and a few other witnesses. In 6: 37, it is likely that Marcion's text read the second *ἵνα μή* (*Marc.* 4.17.9). The reading *ἔβρεξε* in 7: 38, found in D, OL manuscripts, and $sy^{s,c}$, is attested for Marcion's Gospel by Epiphanius (*Pan.* 42.11.6, *σχ.* 10]). Tertullian's allusion in *Marc.* 4.27.8 to 11: 48 reveals that it is probable that Marcion shared the reading *μὴ συνευδοκεῖν* found in D. In 12: 27, though the word order is not certain, Marcion likely read the verbs *ὑφαίνει* and *νήθει* with D and $sy^{s,c}$, though they are also found in Clement of Alexandria.[28] Finally, though not merely a 'Western' reading, it is notable that Marcion's Gospel in Luke 9: 35 is attested as reading that the Son was called *ἀγαπητός* and not *ἐκλελεγμένος*, since the latter reading is that found in our earliest manuscripts, $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, as well as א and B.[29]

[27] *The Gospel According to St. Luke,* ed. American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project (2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984–87), i. 262 lists 343, 716, and 1229 as also containing the reading of D and d and notes the slight changes in wording or word order among these witnesses. Curiously, Marcion's reading is here listed as attesting a word order different from that offered by Tertullian.

[28] In other instances, the evidence for the readings in Marcion's text is less clear. For example, NA^{27} lists Marcion as a witness, with D and a few OL MSS, for the addition of *καί* in 8: 3 though the reading is far from certain as the *et* in Tertullian could be due to the flow of his thought (*Marc.* 4.19.1). In addition, though *καὶ βασιλεῖς* is not attested by Tertullian in 10: 24 (*Marc.* 4.25.12), and is also omitted in D and several OL MSS, it is not clear to what extent Tertullian or Marcion is responsible for the otherwise unattested text of 10: 24b as presented in *Adversus Marcionem*. Finally, given Tertullian's inclination to omit elements in a list, it is not certain that Marcion omitted *καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου* in 10: 27 with D and OL MSS (cf. *Marc.* 4.25.15)

[29] See Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.22.1, 8, 10, 12 and Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.11.6 (*σχ.* 18), with the reading also being attested by Ephrem. The second half of the comment by David S. Williams on this verse is completely erroneous: 'Epiphanius in reading 7 [= Luke 9:35] has *ἀγαπητός*, "beloved," with D W lat and $sy^{(c)p}$ for Luke against Tertullian's *delictus,* which corresponds to *ἐκλελεγμένος*, "chosen," in the majority text of Luke' ('Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel', *JBL* 108

On the other hand, several passages where Marcion's Gospel is different from witnesses to the 'Western' text can be found in readings related to the phenomenon that Westcott and Hort referred to as 'Western non-interpolations'.[30] The passages in Luke, which Westcott and Hort felt could confidently be classified as 'Western non-interpolations', are Luke 22: 19b–20, 24: 3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52.[31] Luke 22: 19–20 is attested by Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.40.3, 4, 6 and in the *Adamantius Dialogue* 108.27 (2.20). Though the precise wording of the verses cannot be established with full confidence, Marcion's text clearly included at least part of the famous 'Western non-interpolation' in vv. 19b–20.[32] Luke 24: 3 is attested by Tertullian (*Marc.* 4.43.2); however, the phrase *τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* at the end of the verse is unattested (i.e. the source is silent as opposed to attesting its presence or omission). Tertullian's silence here cannot be used to substantiate the sentiment expressed in Amphoux's statement 'Marcion, semble-t-il, n'avait pas non plus cette precision emphatique.'[33] Luke 24: 6 is attested by Tertullian (*Marc.* 4.43.5) and Epiphanius (*Pan.* 42.11.6, *σχ.* 76). Though Tertullian does not attest the opening phrase, missing in 'Western' witnesses, Epiphanius does attest the presence of *ἠγέρθη*. Even if

(1989): 481 n. 13). First, *ἐκλελεγμένος* is *not* the reading in the majority text. Second, and far more problematic, for Tertullian's reading Williams has followed a misprint of 4.22.10 in the Eligius Dekkers edn. of *Adversus Marcionem* found in *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera* (2 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), i. 441–726. In his MA thesis upon which the *JBL* article is based, Williams noticed that CCSL here offers *delictus* with no recorded variants, whereas Evans in his edn offers *dilectus* with no recorded variants ('Marcion's Gospel: Reconsidered', MA thesis, University of Georgia, 1982, 91 n. 66). In the same note Williams continues by stating 'we have followed the text of *Corpus Christianorum* at this point against that of Evans. It is evident that the two words are extremely close in form, with only the inversion of "e" and "i" separating them: deligere/dilegere.' Apart from the fact that no reason is given for *why* Williams followed the CCSL reading, and even granting the possibility of some type of exchange of an 'e' and 'i' (though it is not entirely clear what Williams's comment on the Latin means: one would expect *delictus* to have been formed from *delinquere*; 'chosen' to be *delectus* from *deligere*; and 'beloved' to be *dilectus* from *diligere*), a quick glance at 4.22.1 and 4.22.12, where CCSL rightly reads *dilectus*, would have helped Williams avoid this unfortunate error.

[30] As will be seen in the ensuing discussion, Marcion's Gospel has often been erroneously invoked in discussions of these readings, which has led to an unfortunate lack of clarity concerning the differences between Marcion's Gospel and 'Western' witnesses at this point.

[31] B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix,* 2nd edn. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1896), 295.

[32] The testimony of the *Adamantius Dialogue* contributes nothing to our knowledge of the precise reading in Marcion's Gospel. Though the phrase *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* is unattested (i.e. the source is silent as opposed to attesting its presence or omission) for Marcion's Gospel by Tertullian, he alluded to *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον* and cited from v. 20. Walter Bauer's suggestion that Marcion himself created this reading is unlikely (Review of Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott, Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen,* 185 (1923): 13–14).

[33] C.-B. Amphoux, 'Le Chapitre 24 de *Luc* et l'origine de la tradition textuelle du *Codex de Bèze* (D.05 du NT)', *FilNeo* 4 (1991): 27. On the problematic nature of using arguments from silence in reconstructing Marcion's text see n. 6 above and n. 40 below.

one distrusts the witness of Epiphanius,[34] there are no grounds for listing Marcion as supporting the other witnesses in the omission of 24: 6a.[35]

Luke 24: 12 presents a particularly curious example in that a change in the second edition of Harnack's monograph on Marcion dramatically impacted scholarly views. In his first edition Harnack simply passed over Luke 24: 12 in the reconstructed text;[36] however, in the second edition he commented in his reconstruction 'Die Petrus Perikope fehlt' and in the note to the verse wrote that the verse was 'von M. [Marcion] gestrichen, der Petrus hier nicht wünschte'.[37] Shortly thereafter, the view that Marcion omitted this verse began to appear in the scholarly literature, and was found in the critical apparatus up to UBS^{3} and NA^{25}.[38] Frans Neirynck, however, strongly, and in my view correctly, argued that Marcion cannot be marshalled as a witness to its omission, and in UBS^{4} and NA^{26} Marcion no longer appeared as a witness for the omission of Luke 24: 12 in the apparatus.[39] The fundamental point, once again, is that our sources are simply silent concerning this verse in Marcion's Gospel.[40] The broader debate about the (in)authenticity of

34 The fact, however, that Epiphanius elsewhere always refers to the entire phrase by writing *ἀνέστη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε* (*Pan*. 42.11.7 (*ἔλ*. 76); 56.2.8–9; and 69.59.4) may support the view that he is accurately reproducing what he saw in Marcion's text.

35 This is done e.g. by M. W. Martin, 'Defending the "Western Non-Interpolations": The Case for an Anti-Separationist *Tendenz* in the Longer Alexandrian Readings', *JBL* 124 (2005): 274. K. Snodgrass correctly noted, 'part included by Mcion' ('Western Non-Interpolations', *JBL* 91 (1972): 375).

36 See Harnack, *Marcion* (1921), 220* (cf. 229*). Theodor Zahn placed the verse in parentheses in his reconstruction, indicating a verse 'deren Vorhandensein bei Mrc. weder durch positive Nachrichten noch durch sichere Schlüsse aus den Nachrichten über andere Stücke verbürgt ist': *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (2 vols. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1888–92), ii. 493 (reconstruction), ii. 454 (citation).

37 Harnack, *Marcion,* 238* (cf. 247*). K. Aland offered the same analysis: 'weshalb Marcion den Kurztext wählte, ist klar: die besondere Herausstellung des Petrus war ihm zuwider' ('Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II', *NTS* 12 (1965–6): 206).

38 F. Neirynck notes that the reference to Marcion first made its way into the Nestle apparatus in the 16th edn. (1936) through the influence of Harnack: 'Lc. XXIV 12: Les Témoins du text occidental', in T. Baarda *et al*., eds., *Miscellanea Neotestamentica I* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), 52.

39 Commenting that Marcion omitted this verse are e.g. R. Leaney, 'The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (XXIV. 12–53)', *NTS* 2 (1955–6): 111, and Snodgrass, 'Western Non-Interpolations', 373. Neirynck's comments are found in 'Lc. XXIV 12', 52–3. B. Ehrman, who argues for the verse's inauthenticity, noted that Neirynck 'has convincingly shown that Marcion . . . cannot be cited in support of the Western text here': *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford: OUP, 1993), 254 n. 129. The inaccurate handling of Marcion in the discussion, however, remains in A. Dauer, 'Zur Authentizität von LK 24,12', *ETL* 70 (1994): 294–318.

40 As U. Schmid has rightly argued, 'Arguments *e silentio*, creating positive evidence out of a lack of evidence, should not be allowed, even if the alleged omission would match supposed theological preferences of Marcion': 'How Can We Access Second Century Gospel Texts? The Cases of Marcion and Tatian', in C.-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott, eds., *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), 142.

Luke 24: 12 may well be significant;[41] however, Marcion's *Euangelion* has no place in the discussion.

Luke 24: 36, 40, 51, and 52 are all also unattested in the sources for Marcion's Gospel. Although Harnack rightly simply noted vv. 36, 51, and 52 as 'unbezeugt',[42] he again problematically read into the silence of the sources in v. 40 stating that Marcion deleted the verse.[43] Thus, in the two instances where there is clear testimony in the sources concerning a 'Western non-interpolation' (i.e. Luke 22: 19b–20 and 24: 6), Marcion's Gospel appears to have contained at least some of the longer reading. For the five other 'Western non-interpolations' in Luke 24 it bears repeating that our extant sources are *silent,* and it is therefore methodologically problematic to invoke Marcion's Gospel in a discussion of these readings.[44]

In addition, Westcott and Hort also referenced an 'intermediate class' of Western omissions 'that may perhaps be non-interpolations', including Luke 5: 39; 10: 41–2; 12: 19, 21, 39; 22: 62; and 24: 9.[45] Luke 5: 39 is another problematic instance where Harnack, on the one hand, rightly recognized that the verse 'wird für M. [Marcion] nicht bezeugt' but, on the other hand, immediately adds 'der Vers muβ gefehlt haben'.[46] In a brief discussion focusing on this verse, Schmid's evaluation of this view is worth noting: 'This is simply creating positive evidence (in this very case positive negative evidence) out of no evidence at all.'[47] This same criticism could also be applied to several verses discussed above. Luke 10: 41–2; 12: 21; and 22: 62 are unattested and noted as such by Harnack. Luke 12: 19 is likely attested by Tertullian (*Marc*. 4.28.11), though it is impossible to determine whether it contained elements from the end of the verse that are not found in 'Western' witnesses.[48]

[41] A particularly lively discussion took place between the early 1970s and 1990s (see the overview in F. Neirynck, 'Once More Luke 24,12', *ETL* 70 (1994): 319–40, and more recently id., 'Luke 24,12: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation?', in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven UP and Peeters, 2002), 145–58).

[42] Harnack, *Marcion,* 239*, 240*.

[43] Ibid. 239*. This view was already found in Harnack's 1st edn. (*Marcion* (1921), 221* (cf. 229*)). Snodgrass reveals the extremely hypothetical nature of the supposed omission with his comment 'it is *expected* that Mcion *would have omitted* the verse [emphasis added]' ('Western Non-Interpolations', 375).

[44] Parker, in his very accessible discussion of these readings in Luke 24, rightly never invokes Marcion's Gospel as he consistently argues for the greater originality of the shorter reading (see *Living Text,* 165–72).

[45] Westcott and Hort, *Introduction, Appendix,* 176.

[46] Harnack, *Marcion,* 190* (cf. 247*). Harnack's view was accepted e.g. by E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and his Influence* (London: SPCK, 1948), 46, and Aland, 'Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II', 200.

[47] Schmid, 'How Can We Access?', 143.

[48] Harnack apparently believed that *de proventu agrorum suorum* was referring to εὐφόρησεν ἡ χώρα (v. 16), though Tertullian introducing the phrase with *blandientis sibi* more likely points to v. 19 being in view. In v. 19 the rich man addresses his own soul telling it ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά· ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου. It would also make sense contextually for

In Luke 12: 39, the omission of ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καί after ἔρχεται no longer really qualifies as a possible 'Western non-interpolation' due to the discovery of 𝔓[75] and the absence of the phrase there.[49] Finally, in Luke 24: 9 Tertullian (*Marc.* 4.43.2) attests ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου as present in Marcion's text. Once again, most of these verses are unattested for Marcion's Gospel; however, when they are attested, in one instance the evidence is unclear (Luke 12: 19) and in one instance the element is present in Marcion's Gospel (Luke 24: 9). It is striking that once the highly problematic argument from silence is rejected in the reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel, in none of the clear or possible 'Western non-interpolations' does a source attest Marcion's Gospel as containing the shorter reading or omission as found in 'Western' witnesses. In fact, in several instances there are clear indications that 'Western non-interpolations' are present in Marcion's text. Therefore, though there are points of contact in readings found in Marcion's Gospel and the 'Western' text, great care and caution must be employed in delineating the relationship.

CONCLUSION

Recent studies of Marcion's scriptures have undoubtedly revealed the importance of careful study of these texts for understanding the early text of the NT. Schmid's work clearly showed evidence of Marcion's text being related to a 'pre-Western' text in his *Apostolikon,* a text likely already extant with a particular order and form in a ten-letter collection. Though more work on Marcion's Gospel is required and a complete new reconstruction is necessary, there is some indication of a similar state of affairs for Marcion's *Euangelion*. Although Marcion's omissions and potential alterations of readings created a unique text, which may even have had some minimal influence on the textual tradition, in the vast majority of instances, readings found in Marcion's *Euangelion* and *Apostolikon* can be situated in and provide insight into the extant textual tradition evidenced in later NT manuscripts. Further systematic study of Marcion's texts may well yield additional important insight into the early state of the NT text. For this reason, not only 'variant readings', as Quispel put it, but *all* readings 'in the text of Marcion should be examined very carefully'.[50]

Tertullian to be referring to this statement right before citing God's response; however, it is impossible to tell how much of the statement Marcion's text contained.

[49] The phrase is also omitted by א*. Marcion's text also may not have contained the phrase due to Tertullian's citation habit of often inclining to Matthean readings, but not doing so here (*Marc.* 4.29.7; see Roth, 'Towards a New Reconstruction', 213).

[50] Quispel, 'Marcion and the Text of the New Testament', 359.

17

Justin's Text of the Gospels:

Another Look at the Citations in 1Apol. *15. 1–8*

Joseph Verheyden

The work of Justin Martyr is far more than a possible source for studying the earliest history of the transmission of the Gospel text; but it is also that, and it is this aspect of his work that will be looked into in this chapter.[1] The Gospel citations in his writings received quite some attention in the nineteenth century. In 1850 Adolf Hilgenfeld spent some 300 pages of his *Kritische Untersuchungen* on Justin.[2] Some twenty-five years later William Sanday devoted the fourth chapter of his survey of the reception of the Gospels in the second century to Justin.[3] And fifteen years later, in 1891, Wilhelm Bousset wrote a monograph on the Gospel citations.[4] It looks as if the issue was then put to rest for some six decades, until research was resumed by Édouard Massaux in 1950 and Helmut Koester in 1956.[5] And one might say that it

[1] I have used the edn. and tr. of D. Minns and P. Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: OUP, 2009). For the earlier literature, see the quite exhaustive bibliography by A. Wartelle, *Bibliographie historique et critique de saint Justin, philosophe et martyre, et des apologistes grecs du IIe siècle, 1494–1994, avec un supplement* (Paris: Lanore, 2001), 5–304. A good selection of more recent publications in S. Parvis and P. Foster, eds., *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007).

[2] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, der clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's* (Halle: C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1850). Cf. also Id., 'Die alttestamentliche Citate Justins in ihrer Bedeutung für die Untersuchung über Seine Evangelien', *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 9 (1850): 285–439, 567–78.

[3] *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1875), 88–137.

[4] *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1891).

[5] É. Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Irénée* (Leuven: Presses universitaires, 1950; repr. Leuven: Leuven UP and Peeters, 1986), 465–570; English tr.: *The Influence of the Gospel of Matthew on Christian Literature before Irenaeus* (Leuven: Peeters; Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 1992). See also his essay 'Le Texte du sermon sur la

has not really left the stage since. In 1967 Koester's student Arthur J. Bellinzoni published a detailed study of the sayings material.[6] Twenty years later Wolf-Dietrich Köhler went over the Matthew citations once again.[7] In the same year Oskar Skarsaune studied a selected number of Gospel passages in the context of his research on Justin's use of proof-texts.[8] The (rather sparse) material from the Fourth Gospel was touched upon by Joseph N. Sanders as early as 1943 and also had been taken up by François-Marie Braun in 1959.[9] More recently it was studied again by Titus Nagel and Charles E. Hill.[10] In between these two Andrew Gregory published a full-scale study of the Lukan material which takes up the whole of his chapter 7 and constitutes some one-third of the part he dedicates to Luke.[11] This brief survey, which is of course not exhaustive, may illustrate the importance of Justin for studying the history of the Gospel text in the second century.

THE GOSPELS AND JUSTIN

Justin Martyr knew at least two (Matt. and Luke), probably three (Mark), and maybe even all four of our canonical gospels. This is accepted also by those who argue that he also had access to another source or document. Hence this hardly needs to be proven again, but it might be good to draw attention to what may be the crucial argument. It is not that at times he has a text that agrees with that in our critical editions; such evidence is strongly indicative but not decisive. Rather more important is that he says he is citing from the 'apostolic memoirs' (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*) and then cites a text that is indeed completely identical with what we read in the canonical Gospels. The 'memoirs' are 'our' Gospels and the text he cites 'our' text.[12] A good example

montagne utilisé par Saint Justin', *ETL* 25 (1952): 411–48 (repr. in the 1986 repr. of the monograph on pp. 725–62); H. Koester, *Septuaginta und synoptischer Erzählungsstoff im Schriftbeweis Justins des Märtyrers* (Habilitationsschrift; Heidelberg, 1956).

6 *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden: Brill, 1967).

7 *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 161–265.

8 *The Proof from Prophecy* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 32–4, 74–6, 88–90, 100–6, 211–12.

9 J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: CUP, 1943); F.-M. Braun, *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église ancienne* (Paris: Gabalda, 1959), 135–44.

10 T. Nagel, *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000), 94–116; C. E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), 316–37, 337–42.

11 A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 211–92.

12 So, most emphatically, Hill, *Corpus*, 337: 'It is virtually agreed that as Justin uses the term memoirs it encompasses at least the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.' For a more critical, or rather more reserved position, see G. N. Stanton, 'Jesus Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr

can be found in *Dial.* 105.6. Here, Justin introduces a citation as, 'in the memoirs it is written', and then cites Matt. 5: 20.[13] But the argument applies only to (a small) part of the evidence.

The problem is how to explain why, if he knew (some of) the canonical Gospels, Justin so often (too often, in the opinion of some) quotes a text that differs from the one we read in the critical edition of Nestle-Aland (NA) and The Greek New Testament (GNT), and this in such a way that the differences cannot be assigned to any of the variant readings that are attested in the textual tradition that has been preserved. The options are numerous, though not unlimited. Justin may (in some instances) have relied, not on the Gospels themselves, but on the oral tradition that preceded the written Gospels and lived on afterwards well into the second century.[14] Or he may have had access to a document other than our Gospels, close to these but not identical with them, another gospel,[15] or a gospel harmony, pre- or post-synoptic,[16] or a catechism.[17] Or he at times cited from memory or somewhat carelessly.[18] Or he had reasons (stylistic or theological ones) to change the text of the Gospels

and Irenaeus', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, eds., *The Biblical Canons* (Leuven: Leuven UP and Peeters, 2003), 353–70, esp. 360–6. On the vexed question of a possible relation with the Gospel of Peter, see most recently K. Greschat, 'Justins "Denkwürdigkeiten der Apostel" und das Petrusevangelium', in T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, eds., *Das Evangelium nach Petrus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 197–214.

[13] Bellinzoni (*Sayings*, 120) does not fully give in and comments, 'either Justin or his source was here dependent on Matthew'. See also id., 'The Gospel of Matthew in the Second Century', *SecCent* 9 (1992): 197–258, esp. 239–42. But why would the source be interested in indicating that it is quoting from the gospels, or why would Justin take this over if he is solely relying on that source?

[14] See below at n. 19.

[15] The *Gospel of Peter* according to Carl August Credner, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften* (Halle, 1832), 133–49, a suggestion that was taken up by Hilgenfeld (*Untersuchungen*), who also gave the *Protevangelium of James* as a possible source. Another 'synoptic' gospel, now lost, according to Gustav Volkmar, *Über Justin den Märtyrer und sein Verhältniss zu unsern Evangelien* (Zürich, 1853); a fifth 'canonical' gospel for A. Thomas, 'Justins literarisches Verhältnis zu Paulus und zum Johannisevangelium', *ZWT* 18 (1875): 383–412, 490–565; the 'memoirs', sort of Gospel, for E. R. Buckley, 'Justin Martyr's Quotations from the Synoptic Tradition', *JTS* 36 (1935): 175, who then in a way weakens his own suggestion by assuming that Justin later read the canonical gospels. What evidence do we have about when he read these?

[16] Pre-synoptic for Bousset, *Evangeliencitate*; post-synoptic for most others arguing for this option: so Moritz von Engelhardt, *Das Christenthum Justins des Märtyrers* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1878), 345; Sanday, *Second Century*, 136–8.

[17] Bellinzoni, *Sayings*: not a complete gospel harmony, but rather one or more catechisms with a harmonistic text of the gospels (Matt. and Luke). H. Koester, commenting on this hypothesis, suggests the catechism was composed (by Justin?) from a harmony that may go back to Justin himself or had its origins in circles close to him: 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990), 28–30.

[18] K. Semisch, *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justinus* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1848), 16–60, 389–91; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i/2 (Erlangen: Deichert, 1888), 463–585.

as we read it in our editions.[19] Or still, there was no such thing yet as 'the gospel text', and Justin cannot really be blamed for 'deviating' but should rather be studied to catch a glimpse of this earliest period that was lost, almost completely, after the great work of revising and standardizing the gospel text in the fourth century had taken its toll.[20] In principle there is something to say for all of these options, as none of them is utterly impossible. Of course, one or another of these hypotheses has been given up. The suggestion of identifying Justin's source with the *Gospel of Peter* never enjoyed much success and was definitely buried when a copy of the (or a?) *Gospel of Peter* was unburied from the sands of Egypt. Other 'lost gospels' never materialized, but nevertheless this kind of hypothesis seems to have evaporated. But for other options the issue cannot so easily be solved. This is true even for Bousset's famous pre-synoptic harmony. The objection that such a harmony cannot explain how the canonical version(s) of a particular saying came about, works only if one assumes that this harmony was also the source of the canonical Gospels. However, such a conclusion is not required.[21]

All these options have two things in common. (*a*) They all somehow give a place to the 'author' or 'redactor', and the freedom this involves in handling a source or a text. Of course, these concepts can be understood in various ways; they can be maximized or minimized. In a world of 'floating texts', an author's freedom may have been without bounds, or almost so. At least one should say that in such a world the 'author/redactor' factor must have its say and its place

[19] So B. F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1870), 133; A. Baldus, *Das Verhältnis Justins des Märtyrers zu unsern synoptischen Evangelien* (Münster, 1895), 98–100; E. L. Titus, 'The Motivations of Changes Made in the New Testament by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria' (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Chicago, 1942); L. E. Wright, *Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), 11; most emphatically, Massaux, *Influence*; also Koester, *Septuaginta* (for narrative material); Köhler, *Rezeption*, though reckoning with the harmony as a valuable alternative; Nagel, *Rezeption*, 114; Gregory, *Reception*, 291–2 (dependence on Luke or on a source using Luke, while not excluding the possibility that Justin had access to Q and/or L); Hill, *Corpus*, 342. Titus and Wright have tried to classify and explain the differences along thematic and stylistic lines; Titus as a matter of fact leaves open the possibility that Justin's source was oral tradition and/or that he quoted from memory. A similar 'harmonistic' explanation in O. Piper, 'The Nature of the Gospel according to Justin Martyr', *Journal of Religion*, 49 (1961): 155–68, who allows for the 'memoirs' to have played a role along with the canonical gospels.

[20] So in general but illustrated from Justin, W. L. Petersen, 'What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?', in B. Aland and J. Delobel, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History* (Kampen: Kok, 1994), 136–51.

[21] Bousset himself assumed that Matthew and Luke used this same harmony (see e.g. *Evangeliencitate*, 103) and is rightly criticized for this by Bellinzoni (*Sayings*, 28 n. 3), but if that aspect is ignored the pre-synoptic harmony theory is as strong as the post-synoptic variant. Bellinzoni's other criticism ('The principal weakness of Bousset's suggestion'), how this harmony would have survived into the time of Justin after it had been replaced by the synoptic gospels, may be less of a problem than he makes of it.

along with, and perhaps even before any other option, and this not only for the compiler of a gospel harmony but for any other 'author'. But this freedom can also have played a role in a less 'floating' world. The compiler of a gospel harmony may have proceeded with little concern for his source texts. Or he may merely have been collecting what was already around of such sayings; but even then he probably had a margin of freedom, and anyway, this too was an author's or a redactor's decision. Similarly Justin may have kept to his source (a harmony or the individual Gospels), which again is an authorial decision. Or he may at times have deviated from it, either by changing the text or, less drastically, by leaving out part of the citation. The differences which exist between citations that occur more than once in his work are evidence for the latter procedure.

(*b*) These options all offer a solution that is 'known' to have existed, that is, a factor that is commonly accepted by scholars as a valid explanation (oral tradition, use of a gospel harmony, citing from memory, the author's or redactor's freedom). Yet there is a double problem here, and one that separates the hypothesis that Justin was working from the individual Gospels from all the other suggestions. It has to do with the means we have to test the explanation and with the way the explanation is handled. First, how to detect and test the influence of oral tradition? How to look for traces of 'citing from memory'? How to uncover 'floating texts'? Or how to prove the existence of a gospel harmony behind Justin's citations? The evidence that can be gained in this regard from parallel citations in later authors is highly disputable. Some of these authors are rather late, others may have relied on Justin.[22] For several of these parallels, which (too) often differ quite significantly from each other, the

[22] The former raises the question of how this alternative tradition survived through the ages; basically this is the same argument that Bellinzoni used against Bousset and which is mentioned in the previous note, but with this important difference: in this case the source/tradition must have survived for a much longer period than the one assumed by Bousset, a period, moreover, that witnessed the ever-increasing dominance of the canonical text. Against the second observation one might object that a reason should be given why a later author would rely on Justin for citing scripture. The objection can be answered in two ways. These authors may have been relying on Justin for a particular argument in which the citation occurs, taking over in that process his citation without noticing, realizing, or caring too much about its form or conformity with the 'canonical text'. And of course, if Justin (or his circle) was somehow responsible for the composition of (some form of) a gospel harmony, these later authors can also have been relying on this lost work of his instead of any of the writings that have been preserved (see Koester's comments in n. 17 above). For evidence of an early reception of Justin, see e.g. R. Weijenbourg, 'Meliton de Sardes lecteur de la première Apologie et du Dialogue de Saint Justin', *Antonianum*, 49 (1974): 362–6; specifically with regard to the biblical text, W. L. Petersen, 'Textual Evidence of Tatian's Dependence upon Justin's *ἈΠΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΎΜΑΤΑ*', *NTS* 36 (1990): 512–34. On the (textual) tradition of Justin's works in general, see the still valuable comments by A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts in der Alten Kirche und im Mittelalter* (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1882), 130–75 (beginning with a critical note on the possibility that Tatian might have used Justin in composing his *Oratio ad Graecos*).

primary conclusion seems to be that, if they prove anything, it is not so much the existence of a gospel harmony as a source common to all, perhaps not even of a common tradition, but rather the great variety and diversity in citing the text, hence authorial freedom.[23] It also does not help the gospel harmony hypothesis that it seems to be impossible to detect in Justin's citations anything like an overall pattern in the way the Gospel texts would have been harmonized. Second, explanations relying on oral tradition, memory citation, the 'floating text', or otherwise unattested sources always are in danger of becoming the 'easy answer'. The situation is different for those arguing that Justin relied on the Gospels and used them somewhat freely. Here one needs 'proof', one needs to show that Justin could have made a particular change, and indeed had reason to do so. The hypothesis is as strong as the evidence that can be given for it on the basis of individual cases. The cumulative effect can play a role, as it certainly does—and all too easily—in the other options,

[23] Bellinzoni points out that, when citing (his version of) the so-called 'Johannine Thunderbolt' (Matt. 11: 27 par. Luke 10: 22), Justin is remarkably consistent in inverting the order 'father/son' and in omitting βουλῆται at the end of the clause (see *1Apol.* 63.3, 13 and *Dial.* 100.1), which 'probably indicates that Justin's source was not our synoptic gospels' (*Sayings*, 26). He further comments, 'The evidence of many of the fathers [in all, he cites twelve witnesses from four different authors] also reflects these peculiarities of Justin's text, although never in exactly the same words as we find them in Justin.' The latter part of this phrase is crucial, for indeed what the evidence shows above all is variation, and variation of all sorts. Two of the parallels lack the final part of the verse ('and those to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him', see Ps-Clementine *Homilies* 18.20 and Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 1.9.88); two others have only one element (Tertullian, *adv. Marcionem* 2.27 and Irenaeus, *c. Haer.* 2.14.7: 'nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius'), which makes it impossible to say whether they are really citing the first or the second half. Irenaeus cites the full passage twice right after another, but once without (*c. Haer.* 4.6.3) and once with βουλῆται (4.6.1). The Ps-Clementine *Homilies* three times differs from Justin in also reading βουλῆται (17.4; 18.4, 13) and in the last of these, while keeping to the same order as Justin, it changes the structure and misses out on the double εἰ μή. Clement of Alexandria three times misses out on the first element in Justin ('no one knows the Father except the Son'), which makes it impossible to reach a certain conclusion on whether he really was following the same order as Justin (cf. *Paed.* 1.5.20; 7.10.58; 7.18.4). Maybe the evidence from the parallels should be turned upside down and used as a contrast to what Justin is doing. His consistency would be proof of a source other than the canonical gospels, but this consistency is also to be nuanced, for the citations contain slight differences (twice ἔγνω in *1Apol.*, but γινώσκει in *Dial.*, and ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ in *1Apol.* 63.13 and *Dial.*, but inverted in *1Apol.* 63.3; the former of these differences also in Clement and in Irenaeus; is there possibly any influence from John: see the present of the same verb in 10: 15, but the aorist in 17: 25; note also the variant with οἶδα in 7: 29 and cf. Ps-Clem. *Homilies* 18.20). A similar kind of argument can be made against the use of the parallels to *1Apol.* 16.6 and *Dial.* 93.2 (*Sayings*, 39–42). No wonder that some scholars, such as Köhler, are not impressed by those long lists of parallels. Particularly on the evidence from the Ps-Clementine Homilies in their relation to Justin, see also L. L. Kline, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1975), 34–40 (Matt. 11: 27) and id. 'Harmonized Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Justin Martyr', *ZNW* 66 (1975): 223–41; for a critical reply, see G. Strecker, 'Eine Evangelienharmonie bei Justin und Pseudoklemens?', *NTS* 24 (1978): 297–316.

but only in so far as arguments can be formulated.[24] But if that is possible, the cumulative factor can become a most effective element.

Work on Justin's citations is complicated by a number of factors. On a general level, one should always realize that it cannot just be excluded, and indeed is very probable, that several explanations may coexist; hence it would be unwise to try and bring everything under one umbrella. The evidence simply does not allow us to reach absolute conclusions. There will always remain a grey zone, passages for which it is not possible to speak out for one and against the other option. That is a truth. But it is also true that explanations cannot continue to coexist if one proves to be 'better' (more plausible) than the other. If one grows in force, the other should recede. One cannot have both. But well established 'relative' conclusions certainly have their value, especially in this kind of discussion. On the level of Justin's writings, there is first of all the problem that we have to work from a relatively small basis. This is certainly true when compared to the material that is available from Origen or any of the great fathers of the fourth century. As a result, it is often just impossible to check how well established a particular reading might have been. Second, the textual tradition of Justin's writings also is very limited. Specifically with regard to the citations, it cannot be excluded that occasionally the text has been harmonized with or adapted to the 'ruling' text. This problem should perhaps not be overestimated—after all, many of the citations offer a text that is not otherwise attested. But it cannot be ruled out altogether. Third, and perhaps most important, too often the citations have been studied in an atomistic approach, taking them one by one, and with too little regard for the context in which they occur in Justin and the purpose they were meant to serve. Bellinzoni divided the material according to various types;[25] and the same is true of Köhler.[26] As a result one tends to lose sight of the redactional and contextual aspect. Michael Mees has drawn attention to the latter, as well as to form-critical issues (so also already Bellinzoni following Koester) in studying the citations, but as he is basically convinced by the gospel harmony

[24] And by that I mean, 'positive' arguments pointing to features of Justin's redaction as these can be identified from other passages from his work, and not 'negative' arguments, the sort used primarily in the gospel harmony hypothesis ('Justin differs from the gospels, so must have used another source/document').

[25] He groups them into various sections and subsections of a quite different nature. See his Table of Contents: Sayings that occur more than once; Collections or groups of sayings (subdivided into: Sayings based on a single gospel; sayings showing features of harmonisation, further subdivided into three categories); Miscellaneous sayings; Non-synoptic ones.

[26] See again his Table of Contents: dependence on Matt. 'probable' (Matt. along with other gospels; Matt. significantly more important than that on other gospels; material peculiar to Matt.); dependence on Matt. 'well possible' (Matt. or another gospel/document; 'only' possible; possible, though evidence for another source is stronger); dependence on Matt. 'theoretically possible, but not evident' (there exists also another parallel; only a parallel in Matt.; evidence of use of another document is stronger); dependence on Matt. 'improbable'; cases with a parallel in other gospels but not in Matt.

hypothesis he pays little attention to elements that might point to Justin intervening in the text.[27]

All in all, then, much can be said for the position that due and prime attention should be given to the author citing the Gospels, to the purpose he was pursuing by it, and to the context in which the citation occurs, before calling in any form of 'source' or 'document' hypothesis other than the Gospels. This said, all who have worked on this material will agree that it is impossible, within the limits of an essay, to offer anything close to a complete survey of the evidence. And maybe this is not really necessary as one can reach already quite interesting conclusions on the basis of a representative selection of gospel citations. For however appealing it can be to propose overall solutions, as before, it is the work on the 'building blocks', and the way they have been inspected, that counts. It is to these building blocks, the individual citations, that I will now turn, surveying a number of citations with this one question in mind: can a particular citation be explained on the basis of compositional, stylistic, or other purposes, or should it be taken as evidence that Justin had access to a different text of the Gospels, or even to another document (in addition to the canonical Gospels)? I studied two passages from this perspective in some detail in an essay I published a decade ago.[28] Here is another example to ponder: the very first cluster of citations to be found in *1Apol.*

EXEMPLIFYING THE METHOD THE CITATIONS IN *1APOL.* 15.1–8

While a couple of allusions to the Gospels can be identified in the opening chapters of the First Apology, one has to wait till chapter 15 to encounter the first citation; but then citations from the Lord's sayings immediately take centre stage, as much of chapters 15–17 consists of strings of citations.[29] The purpose for citing so extensively from these sayings is described in chapter 14. Justin's major concern in *1Apol.* is to prove the excellence of Christian doctrine, above all, its ethical teaching. This thesis will be developed at length

[27] See, among others, his essay on Justin, 'Form und Komposition der Herrenworte in Justin, Apol. 1,15–17', *Augustinianum*, 17 (1977): 283–306.

[28] J. Verheyden, 'Assessing Gospel Quotations in Justin Martyr', in A. Denaux, ed., *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Leuven UP and Peeters, 2002), 361–77 (*1Apol.* 16.7 and *Dial.* 101.2 // Matt. 19: 16–17 par.; *1Apol.* 16.6 and *Dial.* 93.2 // Matt 22: 37–9 par.).

[29] In addition to the general studies on Justin's quotations and the essay by Mees (n. 27), see P. Prigent, 'Les Citations des évangiles chez Justin (Apologie 14–17)', in P. Maraval, ed., *Lectures anciennes de la Bible* (Strasbourg: CADP, 1987), 137–52 (closely following Mees); cf. also D. A. Hagner, 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr', in D. Wenham, ed., *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 248–9. Specifically on Matthew's fulfilment quotations, J. R. C. Cousland, 'Matthew's Earliest Interpreter: Justin Martyr

from chapter 23 on and will cover the rest of the work.[30] However, in order to show the nature and character of Christ's teaching, in order also to show that he was not a sophist but one who spoke with divine power, in order finally to allow the emperor personally to assess and convince himself of the value of this teaching, Justin proposes, by way of introduction, to give some illustrations of this teaching (so 14.4).[31] Justin thus clearly says that what will follow is a selection from Jesus' teachings, and a selection that was put together with the express purpose of showing the magnificence and high ethical value of these teachings. And what better way to achieve this than to quote from the Lord's Sermon on the Mount/Plain, for that is indeed from where most of the citations are taken. There follow several such illustrations that mostly, though not exclusively, follow the same pattern of listing a series of sayings that as a rule are connected to each other with a mere 'and'. The massive listing of such citations might easily lead to the conclusion that Justin must here have been copying, or at least using, a document. But it is important to notice that these chapters consist of more than mere lists of citations. They also contain comments by Justin, which are interspersed between the various sets or added in the second half of this section that runs from chapters 14 to 20. All this should make one aware of the fact that the citations have been selected on purpose and of the possibility that the comments may have influenced or interfered with the citations.

A first set of four citations is found in *1Apol.* 15.1–4. They all have to do with the Christian understanding of chastity. The choice is not unexpected. Not only is this indeed a major issue of Christian teaching, but it is also the first topic Justin mentions in describing what characterizes a Christian convert. A convert is a person who has turned away from the old (see *πάλαι . . . νῦν* in 14.2). This is further illustrated in several ways: it is about turning away from fornication to chastity, from magical practices to belief in the one good and unbegotten God, from an obsession with wealth and possessions to a life of sharing goods in community, from an attitude of hatred and xenophobia to one of openness towards the other in order to win them for Christ. Not all four of these illustrations will be taken up in chapters 15–17, but the first one in this list is also the first one to be illustrated in the opening lines of chapter 15.

on Matthew's Fulfilment Quotations', in T. R. Hatina, ed., *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 45–60.

[30] On the structure of the Apology, see C. Munier, 'La structure littéraire de l'Apologie de Justin', *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 60 (1986): 34–54; id., *L'Apologie de saint Justin philosophe et martyr* (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1994), 29–40.

[31] The passage is 'vintage apologetics'. On the genre in general and on *1Apol.* in particular, see e.g. H. Chadwick, 'Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity', *BJRL* 47 (1964–5): 275–97; W. Kinzig, 'Der "Sitz im Leben" der Apologie in der Alten Kirche', *ZKG* 100 (1989): 291–317. Cf. also B. Pouderon, 'Une œuvre fantôme: La Question de l'unicité de l'Apologie reconsidérée', *Rivista di Storia del Cristianismo*, 5 (2008): 451–72.

This first topic is formulated in 14.2 as *οἱ πάλαι μὲν πορνείαις χαίροντες, νῦν δὲ σωφροσύνην μόνην ἀσπαζόμενοι*. It is not unimportant to cite the exact wording of Justin, as it helps clarify the choice of the citations illustrating this topic and the way they are formulated. In 15.1 the topic is introduced as, *περὶ μὲν οὖν σωφροσύνης τοσοῦτον εἶπεν*. The word *σωφροσύνη* is not found in the Gospels, but it is of course a correct way to refer to chastity. The four citations that follow, all connected with a mere *καί*, all have a parallel in Matthew's Gospel (or, as I will argue, are taken from that Gospel) and the first three come from the same context. The parataxis should not be misunderstood as if Justin was merely listing 'more of the same', as he will make clear in his comments.

The first citation is a most appropriate one to open an excursus on chastity. It is the saying on adultery. In Matthew it is found in 5: 28, as the second antithesis. The verse has no parallel in Luke.

> *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι*
> *πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν*
> *ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.* (Matt. 5: 28)

> *ὃς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς*
> *ἤδη ἐμοίχευσε τῇ καρδίᾳ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* (*1Apol.* 15.1)

The absence of the opening words of Matt. 5: 28 and the addition of a reference to God in *1Apol.* means nothing and can easily be explained. The former were simply redundant in this context, and many other examples can be cited where Justin leaves out what is not needed for making the case and concentrates on what he regards as essential. The latter introduces a motif that is dear to him (and to the whole of the apologist tradition) and he does not need a model in a source text to use it.[32] The difference between *πᾶς ὁ* and *ὃς ἄν* is virtually non-existent and they are easily interchangeable, as Matthew shows when using the second right after in 5: 32. The change in case and the omission of the second *αὐτήν* offers little to build on for suggesting an alternative source apart from Matthew.[33] The intensification of the verb *βλέπω* is found also in a number of later authors.[34] It is most appropriate, both for opening and strengthening even further an already quite remarkable saying, it is well in the style of Matthew (6: 26 diff. Luke and 19: 26 par. Mark, with *παρὰ θεῷ* following!), and it fits in with the intensifying compound in 15.2.

[32] Cf. C. Munier, *Justin Apologie pour les chrétiens* (Paris: Cerf, 2006), 166 n. 3. It would help to explain how one can sin 'in the heart' (see Baldus, *Verhältnis*, 82; Wright, *Alterations*, 37; Massaux, 'Texte', 419/733). And maybe there even was some inspiration from Matt. after all (see p. 328).

[33] So also *Sayings*, 59.

[34] Ibid. 57–8: Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Apostolic Constitutions, Clement of Alexandria. The latter also has the variant with *βλέπω*, which shows that the reading was not absolutely essential.

The second saying has a parallel in Matt. 5: 29 and another one in 18: 9 (here with a parallel in Mark). In both instances it is part of a double saying applied to 'eye and hand/foot' that is very parallel in form and wording.

29 *εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε,*
ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ·
συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου
καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν.

30 *καὶ εἰ ἡ δεξιά σου χεὶρ σκανδαλίζει σε,*
ἔκκοψον αὐτὴν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ·
συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου
καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ. (Matt. 5: 29–30)

8 *Εἰ δὲ ἡ χείρ σου ἢ ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζει σε,*
ἔκκοψον αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ·
καλόν σοί ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν κυλλὸν ἢ χωλὸν
ἢ δύο χεῖρας ἢ δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον.

9 *καὶ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζει σε,*
ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ·
καλόν σοί ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν
ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός. (Matt. 18: 8–9)

45 *καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε,*
ἀπόκοψον αὐτόν·
καλόν ἐστίν σε εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν
ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν.

47 *καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε,*
ἔκβαλε αὐτόν·
καλόν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν, . . . (Mark 9: 45, 47)

εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε,
ἔκκοψον αὐτόν,
συμφέρει γάρ σοι μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν
ἢ μετὰ τῶν δύο πεμφθήναι εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ. (*1Apol.* 15.2)

Justin keeps to the first half of the saying, the one on the eye. The close parallelism between the two sayings, both in Matthew and in Mark, almost invites dropping one half; and that is what Justin has been doing, in line with his interest in concentrating on the essential. The point that had to be made could be made with the sole saying on the eye, which is the more appropriate one in combination with the saying that preceded, as also Matthew must have sensed when inverting the order of Matt. 18: 8–9 while reusing the saying complex again in 5: 29–30. Combining 15.1–2 with *καί* may not be the best solution, but it is not in tension with Matthew's use of it. Yet Justin's version

seems to have been influenced by the second half as well, a clear sign that he, or his source, read this double saying in the same combination as it occurs in Matthew and in Mark. There is little to go on in making a case for influence of this latter, and even less to suspect the use of a harmony. It suffices to assume Justin knew Matt. 5: 29–30 and had noticed its doublet in 18: 8–9. The former he has just demonstrated by citing Matt. 5: 28, and citing it almost verbatim. To accept the latter one does not really need to postulate a harmony, whose existence is difficult to substantiate. The agreement with Mark in not reading *βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ* counts for little as Matthew's fourfold repetition of this utterly redundant phrase makes it only more obvious how redundant it is, especially in combination with *ἔκκοψον*. The phrase *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν* is more Matthean than Mark's variant with *τοῦ θεοῦ* is Markan, even though it does not appear in Matthew in this particular instance. It is also very much to the taste of Justin himself,[35] who ignores Matthew's 'experimenting' ('into life') and instead makes the saying more 'Matthean' again, maybe in view of what follows in 15.4. The choice between *μονόφθαλμον . . . ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα* and the laborious phrase of Matt. 5: 29b, 30b is an easy one and does not need any inspiration from a model. By using a preposition Justin can avoid the redundant participle. His *ἔκκοψον* is an improvement on Matthew's *ἔξελε* (or Mark's *ἔκβαλε*), because it is the more technical term,[36] and was ready for use (see Matt. 5: 30; 18: 8).[37] The 'eternal fire' occurs in Matt. 18: 8 and certainly is by far the better choice compared to 'Gehenna' when writing for a Graeco-Roman readership with probably very little knowledge of Jewish and Christian literature and tradition. The phrase *συμφέρει γάρ σοι* (but with the more elegant infinitive instead of *ἵνα*) and the detail about the right eye, which adds to the dramatic character of the saying in a most succinct and efficient way, are clear indications that Matthew was the prime model.[38] In short, the differences from Matthew's version are all very well explainable as stylistic changes, easily made and inspired by Matthew's text and style, and can therefore as well directly be attributed to Justin as to a source.[39] The choice for *πέμπω* instead of any of the verbs used by Matthew or Mark may offer the decisive indication that it is the former of these two options that is closest to the truth. Indeed Justin uses the phrase *πέμπω εἰς πῦρ* (*αἰώνιον*) also elsewhere in *1Apol.*, both when citing from scripture (16.12) and in other

[35] Ibid. 88 n. 1.

[36] Massaux, 'Texte', 420/734. The same verb occurs also in *1Apol.* 16.13, in a verbatim citation from Matt. 7: 19 (with its parallel in 3: 10) and Justin uses it again of his own in 27.2.

[37] *Sayings*, 87.

[38] Ibid. 88: 'apparently derived from Mt. 5:29'.

[39] The fact that Justin's reading can be explained from a Matthean doublet may raise the question of how far it is the result of conscious adaptation or rather of coincidence. Köhler (*Rezeption*, 210) reckons with the latter, but the agreements with Matt. 18: 8–9 are so massive that the other option cannot be excluded.

instances (28.1; 52.3). The phrase is not found in the Gospels. Of course, one can always assume that it also figured in his source and that Justin kept it because he likes it, but in such instances, to whom should precedence be given? And of course, one can always speculate about the possibility that Justin changed his source at this point, but how can one be sure this is the only word he changed and how then to reconstruct the source?

The third citation has a parallel in Matt. 5: 32, in the same direct context as the two citations that preceded. Matthew's version of this saying has a parallel in Luke 16: 18 and in part is a doublet of Matt. 19: 9 par. Mark 10: 11.

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι
πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι,
καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται. (Matt. 5: 32)

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς,
ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν. (Mark 10: 11)

λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι
ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται. (Matt. 19: 9)

πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει,
καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει. (Luke 16: 18)

ὃς γαμεῖ ἀπολελυμ ένην ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρὸς μοιχᾶται. (*1Apol.* 15.3)

Compared to the citations in 15.1–2 this third one offers only one half of the saying as it occurs in Matthew and Luke. As Justin explains in 15.5, it is meant to criticize second marriage: *οἱ νόμῳ ἀνθρωπίνῳ διγαμίας ποιούμενοι ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ διδασκάλῳ εἰσί.*[40] This raises a number of problems, for the citation is rather odd in form and content and does not seem to fit this purpose. First, it does not specify the status or situation of the man marrying the divorced woman. Is he divorced as well, or a widower, or is it his first marriage, in which case one would think it is the woman rather than the man who is to be blamed for committing adultery? Second, as it is formulated the rule only applies to the man; but what about a woman marrying a divorced partner? Third, it would seem that Justin has missed out on the more relevant part of the saying to cite the less appropriate one. Fourth, the phrase *ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός* is quite redundant; moreover, it recalls Luke 16: 18 rather than Matt. 5: 32. And finally, one might think that a critique

[40] The word *διγαμία* does not mean 'bigamy', which was not allowed by Roman law, but can only mean 'second marriage', to which it is known that the Church was opposed. See H. Crouzel, *L'Église primitive face au divorce* (Paris: Cerf, 1970), 54; C. Munier, *Mariage et virginité dans l'Église ancienne* (Bern: Lang, 1987), 49.

on divorce in general would be more impressive, and certainly also more in line with the moral standards Justin is promoting, rather than this casuistic illustration. So it is questions all over. Are there any answers?

The lack of any further specification of a particular point in formulating a rule or a law might indicate that the author considers the issue to be immaterial, or that he wishes to exclude on principle any flexibility and discussion, or still that he had reasons not to be too explicit or too detailed about it. The comment in 15.5 might contain proof that there is something of each of these in play. Indeed, the interpretation that is given and the way the rule is reformulated for that purpose stands somewhat in tension with the text of the citation. Of course, it is not absolutely impossible to read the comment, in line with the citation, as applying only to cases of remarriage after divorce. Yet this quite crucial phrase is not repeated in 15.5, which allows for the possibility to exclude second marriage under all circumstances. In any case, that is what the letter of the text says in 15.5, and in all probability that is how Justin wanted the citation to be understood. If there is some truth in this, it may also explain the absence of a counterpart to the citation. If it is second marriage as such that is forbidden, and not the specific case of a man marrying a divorced woman, the rule obviously is meant to apply for both sexes. There is no need also to spell this out. Reason enough also not to be too explicit on the details. The citation should then be read an as invitation to exchange the roles and as a command to wives and husbands alike. That this may indeed well have been Justin's intention can be demonstrated from the way he interprets and comments on the citations in 15.5–7, as I will show below.

This said, the problem remains that this is a rather convoluted way, hence not the most appropriate one, for underscoring the point that second marriage as such is forbidden. Why not say this right from the start and in plain words? One obvious reason is that Justin did not know of such a word of the Lord; there is nothing like this in the Gospels. If he wished to keep to the pattern of illustrating specific cases by a saying, the best that was available was the saying against marrying a divorced woman. It could make for a good start, provided it was correctly explained afterwards. There may also have been another reason for proceeding in this way. Compared to the second saying, which is about a decision one makes for oneself, the first saying may involve a third (and fourth) party (the wife of the one looking upon another woman, and/or that woman's husband); the third saying certainly does and has in any case much more dramatic consequences than the first one. Justin may then well have sensed he should be careful in how to bring this to the audience in order not to scare it away right from the start. So there may also be a rhetorical and apologetic side to it.

However, there is also still a further problem. One might argue that in the case cited by Justin both parties are guilty of engaging in a second marriage.

The divorced partner in any case is, but so is also the one helping to make such a marriage happen. Yet it is a rather complicated way of expressing this, and there is indeed a better and more straightforward one. As a matter of fact, such a verse is found in the Gospel of Matthew, and it cannot have escaped Justin. Matt. 19: 9 reads, *ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται*. The passage has a parallel in Mark 10: 11 and also in Luke 16: 18a (here in combination with a phrase that is closest to Matt. 5: 32b). In 15.4 Justin most probably is citing from Matt 19: 11–12 (see below), and v. 10 contains a phrase that recalls 5: 29–30, which is cited in 15.2 (*συμφέρει*). Yet Justin quotes a text that has its closest parallel in Matt. 5: 32b and Luke 16: 18b. The reason may be that he wished to keep to the same context from Matthew he had been citing from in 15.1–2, even if it meant settling for the 'second best'. Only in 15.4 he moves to chapter 19 because nothing of this is found in chapter 5. An indication that he was first and foremost thinking of Matthew when bringing together these citations in 15.1–4 can be found in *1Apol.* 14.2. He there introduces the topic of Christian chastity (*σωφροσύνη*) by contrasting it to *πορνεία* (see Matt. 5: 32; 19: 9).[41] If Justin then had set his mind on Matthew and apparently preferred to keep to a citation that recalls Matt. 5: 32, while being familiar with the 'better one' of 19: 9, there is no reason to think that in this instance he would exceptionally have switched from Matthew to Luke and was quoting from 16: 18b, only to come back to Matthew right after in 15.4. The way the case is formulated in 15.3 does not argue against this. True, the phrase *ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός* seems to offer strong evidence that Justin is quoting here, if not directly from Luke, at least from a version in which Matt. 5: 32b and Luke 16: 18b had been conflated. However, the case is perhaps not that strong. Unfortunately we do not know what the first half of that conflated verse would have looked like. Matt. 5: 32a and Luke 16: 18a differ significantly from each other. Or maybe there was only this fragment. Justin or his source differ from both Matthew and Luke in writing *ὃς γαμεῖ*.[42] The choice for the indicative instead of the subjunctive or the participle brings the citation closer in line with those of 15.2 and 15.4. The main verb is identical to the one used

[41] The move may be significant and indicative for the way Justin thinks about the formulation he found in 19: 9 (5: 32). He sees no room for the kind of exceptions or nuances Matthew has brought to Mark 10: 11. Of course, he could have opted for Mark's or Luke's formulation and left out the phrase *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείας* in quoting Matt. 19: 9. But that would be a rather more drastic intervention in the text of Matt. than merely substituting 5: 32b for 19: 9. It also made *πορνεία* available for another use. In the only other instance the word is used in *1Apol.* it takes the meaning of prostitution (27.1), the fate of many of the victims of the horrible practice of exposing infants.

[42] Bellinzoni (*Sayings*, 70–1) tries to make a case for dependence on Luke here on the basis of a citation in Theophilus of Antioch (*ad Autolycum* 3.12), which reads *ὁ γαμῶν* before the participle, but if this passage proves anything it is that it depends on Luke and agrees with Justin in the word order (though not the form of the verb), but nothing else.

in Matt. 5: 32.[43] This may be a more important indication of where Justin was looking to than the quite redundant ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός. If this were a conflation of two separate elements from Luke 16: 18ab, it yields a rather odd picture of a harmonizer interested in details and in clarifying things beyond what is necessary. Some scribes of Luke at least have felt it is redundant and left it out (D $sy^{s.p}$ bo^{pt}). So what is the point of such a phrase? It is rather unlikely that Justin wanted to specify in this way that it is possible to remarry one's own wife after having divorced her, but not one divorced by her husband. He hardly seems to be interested in any sort of casuistic or nuances. It certainly does not play in formulating the principle in 15.5. Maybe one should not look too far or for too complicated an answer. It may indeed be an easy one, and it may be found in Matt. 5: 32 (and 19: 9). The divorce sayings in the Gospels all have a tendency to be overly specific in identifying husband and wife. That is true also of the sayings in Matthew: see the phrases 'his wife' (τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ) in 19: 9 and also in 5: 32, and 'marrying another one' (ἄλλην) in 19: 9. The latter of these, if not merely redundant, can be taken as a way to emphasize that this is all about a second marriage, which is Justin's interest here. In this respect Matt. 5: 32b is something of an exception in this respect (contrast Luke 16: 18a 'his wife', 'marrying another', and 18b 'divorced from a husband'). There was perhaps not really any need for it after 5: 32a. But if v. 32b is cited on its own, without its counterpart, it may have been useful to point out with some emphasis that this is about a second marriage; and stylistically it is also an apt way for slightly elaborating upon an otherwise very succinct citation, without altering the content and the spirit of the saying.[44] It also seems that this kind of phrase apparently easily pops up. In *2Apol.* 2, when telling the story of the Christian convert whose husband continues to live in debauchery and cheats upon her, till she finally divorces him (2.6), Justin at first refers to the man as 'the [not: her] husband' (2.1, 2, 4, 5), but then suddenly switches to 'her' in 2.6, 7, 9 (ὁ ταύτης ἀνήρ) for no particular reason.

Finally, why bring up the question of a second marriage and not immediately go for the more impressive example and forbid divorce in general? That

[43] That Justin here changed the text of Luke to μοιχάω because, unlike μοιχεύω, it can be applied to men and women and lacks any link with the Mosaic command (so Bellinzoni, *Sayings*, 71), hardly makes sense. The distinction was certainly not imperative (Liddell-Scott disregards it as Bellinzoni admits). That it would be more 'gender-flexible' would be in line with what I am arguing about Justin's interest in opening up the command to both sexes, but that Matthew would have used the verb with no regard to the Mosaic tradition is just plainly contradicted by the very context in which the passage occurs in his Gospel (5: 31; 19: 7). A few MSS read μοιχᾶται in Luke, as others have substituted Matt.'s clause of 5: 32 for the one in 19: 9. It only proves that the verbs were considered to be interchangeable.

[44] For the argument that an object was needed because the verse was disconnected from its context, see also Massaux, 'Texte', 421/735.

is the topic Matthew addresses in 5: 32a (diff. Mark and Luke) when he has Jesus say that it is forbidden to divorce one's wife, except in the case of the partner committing πορνεία; there is no mention at all of remarriage. The case of the woman in *2Apol.* 2 illustrates that Justin actually agrees with the rule of Matt. 5: 32a: divorce is the last resort for the victim of a partner's πορνεία (with no intention to remarry).[45] In view of the topic he is dealing with in *1Apol.* 15, and the way he is dealing with it, there was no room for exceptions of any kind: the tone is uncompromising and allowing for exceptions would be out of style.[46] Of course, Justin could have cited 5: 32a without the exception clause, but that would entail a quite significant intervention in the text of Matthew, much more drastic, in a sense, than adding the innocent ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός, and that is something Justin apparently did not wish to do. As a result he decides to cite the after all quite strong v. 32b, which he then interprets in 15.5 in a way that leaves no room for exceptions. There is no direct attack on the practice of divorce, but the passage Justin quotes instead at least also *de facto* puts some strong restrictions on divorce. Do we have here an elegant way for offering an implicit disavowal of divorce, without risk of turning away the readership at once? The decision to focus on second marriage may be an indication of this, and also of the fact that Justin actually had the whole verse 32 in mind. The option he takes shows once again how rhetorical skills go hand in hand with a sense for writing realistic, that is, efficient, apologetics.

All in all, then, it would seem that what we have in 15.3 is indeed a citation from Matt. 5: 32b, with v. 32a and 19: 9 lurking in the background, salted with a pinch of authorial initiative.

The first and third sayings are thematically closely connected (from an act of or attempt at adultery to divorce and remarriage). There is also something of a link between the second and the fourth saying, through the motif or connotation of (self-)mutilation, though things are more complicated here and the fourth saying also has links with the first and third one. Indeed, if the second saying formulates a way to prevent one from sinning against the first command (and the third one), the fourth one is both a remedy and a form of ascetic lifestyle that should characterize the Christian, and therefore a quite appropriate conclusion of the series of citations. The result is that the relation between the sayings proves to be a more refined and more complicated one than the mere use of parataxis would suggest. This last saying again directs us towards Matthew and his famous passage on making oneself a eunuch.

[45] On the passage as a whole, see L. Buck, 'The Pagan Husband in Justin Apology, 2,1–20', *JTS* 53 (2002): 541–6.

[46] I prefer this explanation to Massaux's more accommodating 'le renvoi pour adultère n'était plus de mise' (*Influence*, 469).

11 *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,*
οὐ πάντες χωροῦσιν τὸν λόγον [τοῦτον] ἀλλ' οἷς δέδοται.
12 *εἰσὶν γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτως,*
καὶ εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
καὶ εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.
ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω. (Matt. 19: 11, 12)

εἰσί τινες οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ ἐγεννήθησαν εὐνοῦχοι,
εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν·
πλὴν οὐ πάντες τοῦτο χωροῦσιν. (*1Apol.* 15.4)

As elsewhere Justin leaves out what *de facto* is redundant, the repetition of Matthew's v. 11b in 12d as well as the object of v. 11b.[47] It also seems that he has reversed the order of Matthew, though in view of the preceding clause this is only true in part, for if 11b and 12d are regarded as somehow synonymous they can easily be exchanged. A conclusion with *πάντες* certainly is as strong, perhaps even stronger, as a generalizing *ὁ δυνάμενος*. Justin has also altered the order of Matthew's v. 12a–c and replaced what looks like the more logical arrangement (born, made by others, made by oneself) by one that is perhaps less obvious, though the two more dramatic forms, in which mutilation is involved, are now framing the 'natural' one, and in any case he keeps the climactic third part in its place. If the opening words are a bit awkward (*εἰσί τινες οἵτινες*), overall the phrasing is not worse than in the source (double *οἵ*, omission of the object with the first of Matthew's categories). Nothing would suggest the presence of a source here other than Matthew.[48] This fourth saying, more cruel still than the second, will be further explained in what follows, and made more tolerable. Indeed, as he will argue in 15.6, Justin understands the saying not as an incentive to practise an act that was commonly regarded as horrible, barbarous, and maybe even the expression of ultimate lust, but as a call to a life of virginity.

The four sayings are thus thematically closely connected, indeed even interrelated on the level of the gospel itself, and it seems they can all be explained from Matthew's Gospel. These are not just a couple of excellent or prototypical illustrations of what constitutes Christian chastity, together they are simply all the Gospel has to tell about the topic. These four sayings together constitute the full teaching of Jesus on the matter. How much these sayings seem to have been 'brought together' and how this may have influenced Justin's formulation can still be demonstrated somewhat further. Not

[47] In line with his characterization of Jesus' sayings as 'brief and concise' (*1Apol.* 14.6), as Massaux notes (*Influence*, 470).

[48] Bellinzoni (*Sayings*, 61) falls back on his usual 'dilemma' (Matt. or a post-synoptic source citing Matt.), but without any specific argument for the latter.

unexpectedly, the core of this teaching is found in the Sermon on the Mount. Two of the three sayings hail from there. Two of them have a parallel elsewhere in Matthew's Gospel and these parallels have played their role as well. The second of these is followed immediately by the passage on the eunuch, which itself is followed by the second of two sayings of Jesus on children. The first of these occurs just before Matthew's second saying on withstanding temptation by cutting out one's eye. In the transitional verse 19: 10 Matthew expressly repeats the 'husband-wife' motif of 19: 4–5 that is also brought forward in 15.3. The motif that 'it is (not) expedient' of 19: 10 occurs in 5: 29, 30 and 18: 8–9, and also in 18: 6 (here without the negative particle) that makes the transition from the saying on the children to that on withstanding temptation. In all these cases, except for 18: 8–9, it is expressed by the same verb (*οὐ συμφέρει*). The very Matthean-sounding 'entering the kingdom of heavens' in 15.2 occurs also in the two sayings on children (18: 3 and 19: 14) and will be a key motif in the passage on the Rich Young Man (19: 23–4) and the discussion with the disciples it entails (19: 28–30). It very much looks as if the one who has put together these four citations was constantly directed to its parallels and their immediate context, and this one can as well have been Justin if one takes the few deviations from Matthew's text seriously. The few changes that are made to his text most likely reflect Justin's hand (cf. *πέμπω*) or a concern for applying the saying to man and woman alike, which will still be further developed in the explanation that follows.

The first, third, and fourth saying are taken up again in 15.5–6. This time the third one comes first. It receives the shortest comment of the three: it is about second marriage, a common practice as he knows and says, but one that is forbidden by the God of the Christians. This is now formulated in the plural (*οἵ . . . διγαμίας ποιούμενοι*), which allows for including women along with men ('Those who . . . '). The contrast between 'human law' and 'according to our teacher' recalls a similar contrast that occurs in Matt. 19: 26, in the discussion of Jesus with his disciples after he met with the Rich Young Man. The very phrase that was used there for the second part had been added to the first citation in 15.1 (*παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*) and seems to have inspired Justin also here (*παρά* with dative; and see *διδάσκαλος* in 19: 16). One might wonder whether Justin's is a correct interpretation of the citation in 15.3. I think the citation can be understood in this way, as I argued above. By marrying a person who is divorced one 'forces' that person into a second marriage,[49] and is made guilty of the same charge. But in 15.5 Justin also broadens the perspective, for one is now not only forbidden to marry a divorced woman, but to remarry at all. All who are looking for a second marriage, or get involved in it, are called 'sinners', a word he will take up at the end of this section.

[49] Is there an echo of Matt.'s *ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι* of 5: 32a in 15.3?

The first citation is explained in 15.5b. Like the previous one it is put in the plural, though it is still formulated from the perspective of the man (*οἱ προσβλέποντες γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς*). Yet this perspective is also broadened immediately after: first when it is said that it applies to 'the one who does commit adultery' and 'the one who wishes to commit adultery' (*ὁ μοιχεύων* ... *ὁ μοιχεῦσαι βουλόμενος*, note that 'woman' is dropped), and second by expanding the command into a saying on God's capacity for seeing not only our deeds but also our thoughts or desires (*ὡς οὐ τῶν ἔργων φανερῶν μόνον τῷ θεῷ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων*). With the latter Justin rephrases the contrast between committing adultery in act or intention he had just mentioned, in part using the same phraseology (repetition of *οὐ μόνον* ... *ἀλλὰ καί*, of *ἔργον*, and of *παρ' αὐτῷ* as *τῷ θεῷ*; see the previous comment). The fate of such people is briefly referred to: they will be 'thrown out',[50] obviously: from the kingdom, a motif that is dear to Matthew, more than to any other of the evangelists (see Matt. 8: 12 par. Luke 13: 28; also Matt. 22: 13; 25: 30).

'There are some' becomes 'many men and many women' when commenting upon the fourth saying, which is regarded as a call for virginity. 'Many' Christians have committed themselves to such a life, from their childhood on (cf. Matt. 19: 20 *v.l.*), and have continued in this life till their old age. And that such a life is not an idiosyncrasy of one or another tribe or nation is emphatically made clear. It proves that Justin is aware of the delicate nature of this particular instance of Christian chastity and the questions it may raise among his readers.[51]

The 'many men and many women' in the next lines then become 'the innumerable multitude' of converts who fleeing a life of debauchery have found their peace in the teachings of the Lord.[52] Justin ends his comments by recalling another principle and teaching of the Lord, this one on those who are in need of God's support. It anticipates a final citation on this same topic, which he actually paraphrases and by which he concludes this whole section. The citation has a parallel in all three of the Synoptic Gospels.

οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς. (Matt 9:13)

οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς. (Mark 2: 17)

οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν. (Luke 5: 32)

οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν. (*1Apol.* 15.8)

[50] So Barnard's tr. of *ἐκβέβληται*, which may be closer to the mark than Minns and Parvis's 'repudiated' that risks missing the connotation.

[51] Cf. Munier, *Apologie*, 168 n. 2.

[52] Note the, obviously intended, contrast between those many ascetics *οἳ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι* (15.6) and this 'crowd' *τῶν ἐξ ἀκολασίας μεταβαλόντων καὶ ταῦτα μαθόντων* (15.7).

Matthew and Mark are identical, but for the connective *γάρ*; Luke reads *ἐλήλυθα* for *ἦλθον* and adds *εἰς μετάνοιαν*. The latter also occurs in Justin. It may not be enough to conclude that Justin was here following Luke, nor that he found his inspiration in a harmony. It cannot be excluded that the reading, which for Matthew is attested already by sy^s, was also in Justin's text,[53] but the textual tradition of Matthew (and Mark) and the many citations from or references to this verse in patristic literature shows just how easy it was to add in *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, with or without direct influence from Luke. Justin certainly had a good reason for adding the word, as conversion is a key issue in this chapter (see also *μεταβάλλω* in 15.7) and one that is dear to Justin.[54] In paraphrasing the citation in 15.7b Justin adds *σώφρονας* to *δικαίους* and substitutes the triad *ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀκολάστους καὶ ἀδίκους* for the sinners. It is a phenomenon he occasionally also seems to have imported in the citation itself.[55] The choice of the former as a companion term to *δικαίους* is a most appropriate one in a section *περὶ σωφροσύνης*.[56] Creating a triad is well in line with Matthean style. The use of words with *α*- had been anticipated already in 15.6 (*ἄφθοροι*) and is commonly found in Justin, who uses all three words of 15.7b of his own elsewhere.[57] The third term occurs in contrast to *δικαίους* in Matt. 5: 45. The second one had been anticipated by Justin in 15.7 (*τῶν ἐξ ἀκολασίας*) and a word of the same root will occur right after in 15.8b (*κόλασις*; cf. Matt. 25: 46). The first one occurs as a variant reading for *ἁμαρτωλούς* in Luke 5: 32 (א*), but in view of the other attestations in Justin's work that is hardly enough to make him a source for 15.7b here. That it is as a matter of fact Matt. 9: 13 and its context which is in view here can be shown from the final clause of this section in 15.8. Indeed, *θέλει γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος τὴν μετάνοιαν τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἢ τὴν κόλασιν αὐτοῦ* contains some good Matthean vocabulary[58] and in this instance maybe also recalls the

[53] So emphatically, Massaux, *Influence*, 471.

[54] On the importance of this topic, see L. S. Nasrallah, 'The Rhetoric of Conversion and the Construction of Experience: The Case of Justin Martyr', *StPatr* 40 (2006): 467–74, and R. M. Royalty, Jr., 'Justin's Conversion and the Rhetoric of Heresy', ibid. 509–14. Justin comes back to it, and uses the same phrase, in *1Apol.* 28.2 and 40.7, pressing the urgency of God's call (with an allusion to 2 Peter 3: 9 in the latter?).

[55] See e.g. the way Justin in *1Apol.* 15.13 and *Dial.* 96.3 introduces various other categories for those mentioned in Matt. 5: 45.

[56] Justin uses the adjective of his own also in *1Apol.* 2.1; 17.3; 58.3; *2Apol.* 7.9; 15.3. The verb *σωφρονέω* in *1Apol.* 3.2; 13.2; 21.5; and *2Apol.* 2.2; and *σωφρονίζω* in *2Apol.* 1.2; 2.2; 12.8; the adverb *σωφρόνως* in *2Apol.* 2.2; the noun *σωφροσύνη* also in *1Apol.* 6.1; 10.1; 14.2; 15.1.

[57] See *ἄδικος* in *1Apol.* 7.4; 8.4; 16.12; 18.1; 20.4; 52.3, 7; *2Apol.* 1.2; 4.4; 5.1; 9.1, 2; 11.1; Justin also uses the verb, the adverb, and two forms of the noun. For *ἀκόλαστος*, see *1Apol.* 9.5 and *2Apol.* 1.2; also the noun and the verb occur. For *ἀσεβής*, see *1Apol.* 5.3 (with *ἄθεον*); 23.3; 24.1; 27.3 (again with *ἀθεῷ*, and now also *ἀκρατεῖ*); 40.8, 10; 53.8; 54.2 (*κολασθησομένους διὰ πυρὸς τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς*); 57.1 (*ἐπὶ κολάσει τῶν ἀσεβῶν*); *2Apol.* 2.4; 3.2 (with *ἀθέων*); 4.4; 10.4.

[58] Cf. 'the heavenly Father', *κόλασις*, the motif of '(doing) the will of the Father' (Matt. 6: 10; 7: 21; 12: 50; 18: 14!; 21: 31; 26: 42, several of these passages being peculiar to Matt.).

text from Hos. 6: 6 that is quoted in Matt. 9: 13a (and again in 12: 7).[59] If so, one might also point out the phrase 'your teacher' that occurs right before in Matt. 9: 11 (diff. Mark/Luke), yet another Matthean motif (see also 17: 24; 23: 8), to be compared to 'our teacher' of *1Apol.* 15.5. In that same v. 11 Matthew follows Mark in repeating the stock phrase 'tax collectors and sinners' (see also Matt. 9: 10 par. Mark 2: 15 and Matt. 11: 19 par. Luke 7: 34). Matthew also uses the first of these terms in other combinations, 'tax collectors and Gentiles' in 18: 17 (sing.), 'tax collectors and harlots' in 21: 31, 32. In Matt. 5: 45–7 the tax collectors are likened to 'Gentiles', and both of them to 'evil and unjust people' (v. 45). The latter also occur in *1Apol.* 15.7; the former are contrasted in Matt. 5: 45 to the 'good ones' (see also Matt. 7: 18 and 12: 34). In 12: 39 and again in the doublet in 16: 4 Matthew combines them with the adulterous ('an evil and adulterous generation'). Mark had preceded him with a similar combination ('this adulterous and sinful generation') in 8: 38, which neither Matthew nor Luke took over there, but that occurs roughly in the same context as that in which Matthew introduces it (par. Mark 8: 11–13). How much of all this may have played a role in Justin's composition is difficult to say, but it would allow for a nice, be it indirect, reminiscence of the motif of adultery at the very end of this section on chastity.

The move from citations on chastity to Matt. 9: 13 may seem to be a quite adventurous one. It is less of an adventure if one takes into account that *1Apol.* is not just about defending Christianity or making it known, but also about winning over people to Christianity, which is a key issue and a major purpose of Justin's project, as was said above. It may also help if one realizes that this motif of calling upon the sinner (and the joy it involves on the part of the Lord) has been developed by Matthew in the Parable of the Lost Sheep in 18: 12–14, that is, right after the saying on withstanding temptation in 18: 8–9.[60]

CONCLUSION

The brief survey of research on the Gospel citations in Justin shows that scholars have been looking in all possible directions to make sense of the way he is quoting them. It led me to a reflection on method and a plea to give due attention to the role of the author citing such texts, the purpose he was pursuing, and the context in which the citations occur. In illustrating this rule

[59] Scholars are divided on whether 15.8b should be considered as a quotation or as part of Justin's comment (so Bellinzoni, *Sayings*, 77), but that is in a sense immaterial.

[60] Luke, it should be noted, again connects with it the motif of the sinner repenting (see 15: 7 and also in the parallel in 15: 10), but Matthew's *πλανάω*, 'going astray', may be the more appropriate phrase for designating those living in sin but still eligible for salvation.

I have focused not only on the citations but also on Justin's comments that accompany these. The combination certainly helps clarify some of the formulations used in citing from the sayings. It may also help to illustrate that an author who can put together these kinds of comments, that are full of reminiscences and allusions to parallel texts, may well be capable of also having put together the citations themselves. I am of course fully aware that the passage that was studied, with its string of citations, is perhaps a somewhat peculiar case, but is an important one and if the hypothesis works for such a case one may have good hopes it will also work for the isolated citations.

18

Tatian's Diatessaron and the Greek Text of the Gospels

Tjitze Baarda

In Memory of a Friend: Prof. Dr W. L. Petersen
(d. 20 December 2006)

INTRODUCTION

The task which has been outlined for this chapter is not an easy one: 'What can be said about the *Greek* text of the Gospels used by Tatian?' By 'Tatian' the editors meant the harmony of the four Gospels, the 'Diatessaron', which has been ascribed to the person with that name.[1] And, indeed, the question of what kind of Greek text Tatian knew is not an easy one to answer. Before Zahn's attempt to reconstruct the Diatessaron in 1881,[2] scholars had at their disposal only Tatian's *Oratio ad Graecos*, an apology which, although it was written in Greek, does not provide us with an insight into the character of his Gospel text. Its textual references are not only few[3] but also are allusions rather than explicit quotations.[4] Moreover, these references may have been

[1] I hope that I can fulfil the task. Due to my interest in the Diatessaron problem since the 1950s I can refer to several articles of my hand. Several of these articles are collected in (1) J. Helderman and S. J. Noorda, eds., *Early Transmission of Words of Jesus, Thomas, Tatian and the Text of the New Testament* (Amsterdam: VU-Uitgeverij, 1983), (2) S. J. Noorda, ed., *Essays on the Diatessaron* (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994); I found also some interesting introductions to the Diatessaron on the internet, esp. L. McFall, 'Tatian's Diatessaron: Mischievous or Misleading?', *WTJ* 56 (1994): 87–114, and Peter M. Head, 'Tatian's Christology and its Influence on the Composition of the Diatessaron', *TynBul* 43 (1992): 121–37, two articles with useful presentations of important literature on the harmony of Tatian.

[2] Th. Zahn, *Tatians Diatessaron* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1881).

[3] Esp. Matt 13: 44; Luke 6: 25; John 1: 1, 3, 5, 9; 4: 24; H. Olshausen, *Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien* (Königsberg: Unzer, 1823), 337–8, exaggerates when he writes 'Tatian citirt ja auch eine Menge anderer Stellen aus dem Johannes', but Olshausen did so to fulfil his apologetic aim, namely to show that those critics who assumed a late date for John's Gospel were wrong.

[4] R. M. Grant, 'Tatian and the Bible', *StPatr* 1 (1957): 297–306, esp. 297.

influenced by the goal for which he used them, as for example is the case in John 1: 5.[5] Therefore we will deal here especially with the question whether *or* to what extent we can establish his Greek text on the basis of what has been preserved of the original Diatessaron. A decisive and final answer cannot be given with much assurance, due to the fact that our sources are not very early and that much of the history of early Christian writing lies in the dark or only shines through in relatively late texts.[6]

A LOST GREEK TEXT?

One of the disagreements that I had with my late colleague and dear friend Bill Petersen, author of a *magnum opus* on the Diatessaron, was concerning the original language of this harmony.[7] While he opted for a *Syriac* origin, I preferred the idea of an original *Greek* harmony. In my view,[8] Tatian had developed the idea for his harmony in the school of Justin (whose successor he became[9]) in Rome; he may even have followed the footsteps of his predecessor when he created his harmony.[10] Tatian had acquired a Greek education and had been initiated in Greek mysteries before he became a convert to Christianity in Rome. He wrote a vehement apology in Greek, the *Oratio ad Graecos*, in which he blamed the Greeks for the inconsistency of their philosophy and their lack of historical accuracy. It could not have escaped Tatian's attention that in Greek attacks against Christianity the Gospels had been severely criticized because of their inconsistency and inaccuracy.[11] So there was a good reason for Tatian to use the four Gospels as 'sources' for his own Gospel, the Diatessaron, a Gospel which exuded unity and harmony, the

[5] Cf. 'John 1: 5 in the Oration and Diatessaron of Tatian, Concerning the Reading καταλαμβάνει', *VC* 47 (1993): 209–25.

[6] This is also true for other 2nd-cent. Christian authors, even for those writing in Greek, such as Justin and Clement, because their works are preserved in rather late MSS.

[7] W. L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), esp. 118–19, 124, 167, 181–2, 185, 197, 220, 225, 237, 343–4, 384–97, 428.

[8] Cf. T. Baarda, 'ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ–ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ: Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 133–56; cf. also T. Baarda, *Vier = Een. Enkele bladzijden uit de geschiedenis van de harmonisitiek der Evangeliën* (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1969).

[9] Some have guessed that Justin had made a harmony of the synoptic Gospels, cf. A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 139–42 (cf. Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 27–9 and *passim*).

[10] W. L. Petersen, 'Textual Evidence of Tatian's Dependence upon Justin's ἈΠΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ', *NTS* 36 (1990): 512–34; cf. idem, *Diatessaron*, 346–7.

[11] e.g. Celsus in his *Alethes Logos*, who labeled the Gospels as lies and fabrications (cf. Baarda, 'ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ–ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ', 133–4).

'hallmark' of Christianity in Tatian's perception.[12] Therefore, it seems highly probable that Tatian composed his Gospel Harmony in the Greek language,[13] based on the historical memoirs that he had at his disposal, the four Greek Gospels.[14] We do not know whether the result of this composition was marketable; anyway, in the early fourth century Eusebius wrote that even in his time it was still in use in some circles.[15] Now, if we had this Greek Diatessaron in our hands, we would find in it readings that Tatian found in manuscripts of an earlier date than our earliest NT papyri. However—unfortunately so—the Greek harmony no longer exists. Some scholars guessed that traces of it could be still found in specific variant readings that are present in specific Greek Gospel manuscripts,[16] and in a third-century Greek fragment that was discovered in Dura Europos and was attributed to Tatian's harmony.[17]

THE SYRIAC DIATESSARON, ANOTHER LOST TEXT

There can be no doubt that there once was a *Syriac* Diatessaron. In the first half of the fifth century Theodoret wrote that he found more than 200 copies of this harmony in churches of his diocese (Cyrrhus, in the north of Syria);[18] it

[12] Baarda, 'ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ–ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ', 145–7 ('Tatian as Herald of Truth'), 149–51 ('Tatian as an Historian'), 151–4 ('Tatian as an Apologist'); cf. M. Elze, *Tatian und seine Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), esp. 128, who speaks of 'Das innerste theologische Motiv Tatians'.

[13] A reminiscence of a Greek harmony might be the fact that Tatian is sometimes denoted as a Greek (e.g. Theodore Bar Koni, Moses Bar Kepha, Chronicle of Seʿert).

[14] It is, of course, quite possible that Tatian also had one or more other sources at his desk, when he composed his harmony, but not all attempts to present such extra-canonical elements are realistic; cf. e.g. T. Baarda, 'Matthew 18: 14c: An Extra-Canonical Addition in the Arabic Diatessaron?', *Le Muséon,* 107 (1994): 135–49; id., 'A "Non-Canonical Version" of Luke 7: 42b? The Reading "τίνα [αὐτῶν] πλεῖον ἠγάπησεν", Ascribed to the Diatessaron', in A. Denaux, *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 97–129.

[15] Cf. K. Lake, *Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1926), i. 396 (*H.E.* 4.29.6: ὅ καὶ παρά τισιν εἰς ἔτι νῦν φέρεται). The word τινες means 'some or several people' or 'certain people' (certainly not 'many' as some have guessed).

[16] Cf. for specific literature: T. Baarda, 'The Diatessaron of Tatian: Source for an Early Text at Rome or Source of Textual Corruption', in: C.-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott, *The New Text in Early Christianity* (Lausanne: Zèbre, 2003), 93–138, esp. 96–7 and *passim.*

[17] C. H. Kraeling, *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura* (London, 1935); see for the discussion on the value of this text Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 196–203, 224–5; D. C. Parker, D. G. K. Taylor, and M. S. Goodacre, 'The Dura Europos Gospel Harmony', in D. G. K. Taylor, *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Birmingham: University Press, 1999), 192–228.

[18] The Diocese of Cyrrhus, although small, counted 800 churches. For the text cf. Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 41–2.

seems likely[19] that these copies contained this harmony in the Syriac language. In any case, the fact that several Syriac authors refer to the Diatessaron of Tatian[20] seems to indicate that they knew the harmony in the Syriac language. Now, these authors often mentioned the fact that Mar Ephraem wrote a commentary on it, which might indicate that there was a more or less official Syriac Diatessaron in the fourth century. The Arabic Diatessaron which probably dates from the early eleventh century tells us that ʿAbū'l Farağ ʿAbdullah ibn ʿaṭ-Ṭayyib translated the Diatessaron from Syriac into Arabic.[21] The Syriac Diatessaron, which for a long period was transmitted in Syriac-speaking regions, is as far as we now know no longer extant, but its text still shimmers through the Arabic version.[22]

THE ARMENIAN VERSION OF EPHRAEM'S COMMENTARY

The publication of the Latin translation of an Armenian version of Ephraem's Syriac commentary on the Diatessaron[23] inaugurated the era of Diatessaronic studies, beginning with Th. Zahn.[24] These studies have resulted in some interesting reconstructions of the Syriac Diatessaron that Ephraem used for his commentary. However, it should be kept in mind that Zahn and several

[19] Likely, for one cannot wholly exclude the possibility that Theodoret was thinking of Greek exemplars that were found in the parishes of his diocese, which were read in the services and then translated by a Meturgeman.

[20] A collection of testimonies of Syrian and Arabic authors is given in Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 51–2 (Theodore Bar Koni), 52–3 (Ishoʿdad of Merv), 53–4 (Ishoʿ Bar 'Ali), 54–5 ('Abū'l Ḥasan Bar Bahlul), 55–6 (Moses Bar Kepha), 57 (Agapius of Hierapolis), 57–8 (Chronicle of Seʿert), 59–61 (Dionysios bar Ṣalībī), 61 (Michael the Syrian), 62 (glosses), 62–4 (Bar Hebraeus), 64f. (ʿAbd Isōʿ Bar Berika), and 65 (Maris Ibn Salomonis).

[21] Cf. A.-S. Marmardji, *Diatessaron de Tatien* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1935), 2, ll. 6–7.

[22] There was a tendency to underestimate the contribution of the Arabic version, but a careful reading of the Arabic text may tell us a lot more about the Syriac Diatessaron, cf. T. Baarda, 'An Archaic Element in the Arabic Diatessaron? (T 46:18 = John xv.2)', *NovT* 17 (1975): 151–5; id., 'To the Roots of the Syriac Diatessaron Tradition (T 25:1–3)', *NovT* 28 (1986): 111–32; id., ' "Geven als Vreemdeling": Over de herkomst van een merkwaardige variant in Ms, 713 in Mattheüs 17,26', *Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift,* 42 (1988): 99–113; N. P. G. Joosse, *The Sermon on the Mount in the Arabic Diatessaron* (Ph.D. Vrije Universiteit, 1997), 45–55, and *passim*.

[23] The tr. of the Armenian text (publ. in 1836) was made by J. B. Aucher (and G. Moesinger), *Evangelii Concordantis Expositio facta a Sancto Ephraemo Doctore Syro* (Venice: Mechitarists of San Lazzaro, 1876); a careful new Latin tr. of its text was made by L. Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant, Version Arménienne* (Leuven: Durbecq, 1954), based on his own magnificent edn. of the Armenian text (*Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant, Version Arménienne* (Leuven: Durbecq, 1953); the study of the Diatessaron is greatly indebted to the efforts made by the late Dom. Leloir.

[24] Zahn, *Diatessaron*; Zahn made an attempt to reconstruct the Diatessaron in Latin with the Ephraemic text in the tr. of Aucher and Moesinger as the basic text.

other scholars after him had at their disposal only a *Latin* translation[25] of an *Armenian* version of the *Syriac* text, which sometimes led to wrong conclusions about the exact Syriac text. For example, in Matt. 8: 28 par., Zahn accepted as the name of the people on the other side of the sea 'Gergeseni', because that was the name that he found twice in the Latin translation of Ephraem's commentary.[26] We now know, however, that this was not the name found in the Syriac *Vorlage* of the Armenian commentary.[27] Zahn himself was apparently somewhat surprised when he found 'Gergeseni', because he writes in a note that in the extant Syriac versions of the separate Gospels we have only the reading 'Gadarenes'. We now know for sure that ܓܕܪ̈ܝܐ , 'Gadarenes' was, indeed, the name given in Ephraem's commentary (16: 1)[28] and therefore the name found in his Syriac Diatessaron text.[29] If our idea of an original Greek Diatessaron is valid, its text must have read *εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν*. Unfortunately we cannot answer the question of which of the three Gospels had led Tatian to the choice of this name,[30] but it was most likely Matthew—or was it perhaps Luke, or both?[31]

THE SYRIAC TEXT OF EPHRAEM'S COMMENTARY

As we have seen in the preceding paragraph, the discovery of large parts of Ephraim's Syriac Commentary[32] was helpful for giving a better insight into the

[25] See for the danger of merely using the Latin tr., T. Baarda, 'The Text of John 5,7 in the Liège Harmony: Two Studies in the Thesis of Daniël Plooij', *ETL* 81/4 (2005): 491–502.

[26] Zahn, *Diatessaron*, 140–1. (§22); the Armenian text reads indeed Գերգեսացիքն (Leloir, *Commentaire* (1953), 86:4.27 (ch. VI; 26–7)); it is very strange that the latest reconstruction of the Diatessaron (I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Vetus Evangelium Syrorum, Diatessaron Tatiani* (Madrid: CSIC, 1967)) completely neglects Ephraem's references here.

[27] Cf. T. Baarda, 'Gadarenes, Gerasenes, Gergesenes and the Diatessaron Traditions', in *Neotestamentica et Semitica, Studies in Honour of Principal Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1969), 181–97.

[28] Cf. L. Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant, Texte Syriac* (Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1963), 164: 4; unfortunately, Leloir gives a *wrong* impression when he renders the name as 'Gergesaei' (following his tr. of the Armenian text, which indeed has 'Gergesaei'. Still more confusing is his rendering in his French tr. ('Géraséniens').

[29] H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ii (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 23, app. 2; 141, app. 1; 282, app. 2, already noted *Γαδαρηνῶν* as Tatian's text, apparently following the text of the Arabic Diatessaron.

[30] *Γαδαρηνῶν* is attested in Matt. (8: 28: Mss. א*(?) B C*M *Δ*; cf. Sy$^{s.p.h}$), in Mark (MSS A C E F G H M S *Π Ω* 2 fam[13] 157 pc; cf. Sy$^{p.h}$ contra Sy^{s}) and in Luke (8: 26: MSS A E K M S U W *Γ Δ Λ Π Ψ* 2 fam[13] 28 565 1071 1424, cf. Sy$^{s.c.p.h}$).

[31] In my view 'Gergesenes' is a variant reading which was most likely dependent on Origen's commentary (cf. 'Gadarenes, Gerasenes, Gergesenes', 89–91), so that Tatian could choose only between *Γαδαρηνῶν* and *Γερασηνῶν*, the latter being most likely the original text of Mark and perhaps of Luke, whose 'Gerasenes' has very good credentials.

[32] Besides Leloir's edn. of 1963 we have now other large sections of the commentary in Leloir's edn. of 1990, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant, Texte Syriaque* (Leuven and Paris: Peeters, 1990).

Syriac Diatessaron text, whereas the Armenian text could put us on the wrong track. This is also the case in John 8: 57, where the common Greek text reads *Πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὔπω ἔχεις, καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακας;* ('You are not yet fifty years old, and you have seen Abraham?'). Zahn's reconstruction of the Diatessaron text ('Quinquaginta annos non habes, et Abraham vidisti?'[33]) suggested that Tatian's Harmony followed this Greek text. It was only after the Syriac text of the commentary was found that we know for sure that Ephraem's Diatessaron read ܒܪ ܚܡܫܝܢ ܫܢܝܢ ܠܐ ܗܘܝܬ ܘܐܒܪܗܡ ܚܙܟ, 'You are not yet fifty years old, and Abraham has seen you?'[34] This presupposes a different Greek wording— . . . *καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακέ σε;*—which is actually found in several texts.[35] If it was, as I would guess, the text in the Greek Diatessaron, Tatian must have found it in a Greek manuscript in Rome, and so he would become the earliest witness to this reading, a reading that might have been the original text of the passage—as I have explained elsewhere.

THE ARABIC DIATESSARON

When the Arabic Diatessaron of ʿAbū'l Farağ ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib[36] was printed for the first time, there was no doubt that it represented an Arabic version of the Syriac harmony. However, to what extent this text does represent the wording of the original Syriac harmony, let alone that of its Greek model, has been a question of debate. Some scholars held the view that the Arabic text had preserved the order of the pericopes of the harmony but that its text was revised after the Syriac Vulgate, the Peshitta; this means that for them it was of no avail for the reconstruction of the precise text of the Diatessaron.[37] Others, among whom was Hermann von Soden, defended the thesis that (*a*) the *Greek* Diatessaron could still be traced in this late Arabic translation, and (*b*) that the Arabic version shows to what extent the Greek textual tradition of the Gospels

[33] Zahn, *Diatessaron*, 190 (§69); the Armenian text, indeed, has this form of the text . . . և զԱբրահամ տեսեր դու, '. . . and you saw Abraham?'.

[34] Leloir, *Commentaire* (1963), 186: 5–6 (the words are a quotation, for Ephraem adds ܠܡ, 'quoth').

[35] Cf. T. Baarda, 'John 8: 57B: The Contribution of the Diatessaron of Tatian', *NovT* 38/4 (1996): 336–43; this variant reading is found in some Greek MSS (א, 070 [=0124], 𝔓75), in Old Syriac (Sy^s), in several Coptic texts; I also found it in an Ethiopic MS and in a Muslim Arabic MS (11th cent.), cf. id., ' "Abraham has seen you?" John 8: 56–9 in a Letter of al-Ḥasan b. Ayyūb' (*NovT* 53 (2011), 390–402).

[36] Cf. 'The Author of the Arabic Diatessaron', in T. Baarda et al. eds., *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, i (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 61–103.

[37] 'Für den Text des Diatessarons ist . . . der Araber bis auf weiteres gar nicht zu benützen' (Adolf Harnack) or: the Arabic text is 'so corrupt that it has very little value for reconstructing the original text of the Diatessaron' (Kirsopp Lake), see Baarda, 'To the Roots' (cf. above, n. 22).

had suffered from corruption through the Diatessaron, especially in the so-called Koinè text—although it was acknowledged that in some cases 'Tatian' may have preserved an early text.[38] It is my conviction that such pessimistic verdicts about the value of the Arabic text for the reconstruction of the Diatessaron are not based on solid ground.[39] Let me give some examples which may illustrate the importance of the Arabic text. The Arabic harmony presents three 'callings' of a tax-collector,[40] one of Matthew, one of James, and one of Levi. The name Matthew is, indeed, found in Matthew's Gospel, Levi in Mark *and* in Luke. James is only found in some manuscripts of Mark.[41] The name 'James' was so unexpected that Ciasca, the editor of the *editio princeps*, corrected it into 'Levi' (لاوي), a rendering which then was also adopted by later translators: Hamlyn Hill (1895, ²1910), Hogg (1897), and Preuschen (1926). Consequently, the true text remained obscure for a long time. However, all Arabic Diatessaron manuscripts have only the name 'James' (يعقوب) Now, it was known for a long time that Ephraem had also mentioned 'James' in his commentary, as can be seen in its Armenian version (Յակոբոս)[42]; the newly found Syriac text confirmed that 'James' was the correct name: ܓܒܝܗܝ ܠܝܥܩܘܒ ܡܟܣܐ, 'He chose *James* the tax-collector'.[43] This confirms the reliability of the Arabic Diatessaron at this point, and most likely also in the threefold story of the election of Matthew, James, and Levi, as part of the original Syriac Diatessaron, and most likely of its Greek model. Tatian must have found the name 'James' in his manuscript of Mark when he made his harmony, *c.*160/70; this makes him the oldest witness known for the reading 'James' (*Ἰάκωβον*) in Mark 2: 14.

A second example of the importance of the Arabic version is found in Matthew 17: 26.[44] This text presents us here with a peculiar 'addition': after Jesus' answer 'So the sons are free', the Arabic text reads 'Simon said to him: "Yes". Jesus said to

[38] H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments . . .*, II, iiA (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ²1913), 1535–1648 (§§352–81); cf. Baarda, 'The Diatessaron of Tatian', 96–7; cf. also Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 155–8.

[39] In the period before the discovery of the Syriac text of Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron (see n. 28), scholars based their knowledge of the Diatessaron mainly on its Armenian version, and thus they decided that where the Arabic text differed from (the Latin translation of) the Armenian version of Ephraem's commentary, the Arabic Diatessaron text was inferior. However, as we have seen the Armenian version does not always present the original text of Ephraem's commentary.

[40] I will deal with these passages in a forthcoming article ('The Calling of the Tax-Collector in the Arabic Diatessaron, Matthew, James, and Levi').

[41] D *Θ* 13 69 124 543 565 676 788 826 828 1506 and 2508, Origen (?), Old Latin a b c d e ff² r¹, Vulgate G, in some Capitularia of the Vulgate, and some Syriac commentaries.

[42] Cf. Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire (Arm)* (1953), 67: 7.

[43] Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire (Syr)* (1990), 48: 31 (tr. 49: 34), the beginning of ch. 5: 17b.

[44] For a broader discussion of this verse, cf. T. Baarda, 'Geven als vreemdeling: Over de herkomst van een merkwaardige variant van Ms. 713 in Mattheus 17,26', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift,* 42/2 (1988): 99–113.

him: "*Give you also to them as a stranger*" '(اعطيهم انت ايضاً كالغريب).[45] When Zahn discovered this reading in the translation of Ciasca in 1892,[46] he was reminded of a text that he had neglected in his 1881 reconstruction of the harmony on the basis of the Armenian version of Ephraem's commentary.[47] The Armenian text has, indeed, the following phrase արդ երթ տուր և դու իբրև զմի յաւտարաց, 'Now go,[48] give you too as one of the strangers',[49] a reading more or less confirmed by the newly found Syriac text: ܗܒ ܠܗܘܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܟ ܢܘܟܪܝܐ, 'give to them, therefore, as a stranger'. This reading fully agrees with the Arabic reading given above. So, it is obvious that the Syriac Diatessaron has preserved here an addition to the text that had already attracted attention, because there was a Greek manuscript—Ms. 713[50]—containing a similar addition: *ἔφη Σίμων· ναί. λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· δὸς οὖν καὶ σὺ ὡς ἀλλότριος αὐτῶν*. It is obvious that the next question must be: did Tatian read this (*twelfth*-century) reading already in a *second*-century Greek manuscript of Matthew in Rome? Or was it Tatian himself who created this 'addition' for his harmony, perhaps to underscore that the disciples should live as 'foreigners' in this world.[51] The second alternative has been accepted by several textual critics.

THE EASTERN BRANCH OF THE DIATESSARON AND THE GREEK TEXT OF TATIAN

The search for the Greek text which Tatian had consulted for his harmony follows a road full of surprises and traps. Despite the increase in our sources since Zahn's attempt at reconstructing the remains of the Syriac Diatessaron (in 1881), we cannot deny that scholars often had problems in deciding which

[45] Marmardji, *Diatessaron*, 240: 4–5.

[46] A. Ciasca, *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae Arabice* (Rome, 1888), 45; col. 2:2–3 (Arabic text: 97: 2–3).

[47] Zahn, *Diatessaron*, 166 (§45); in 1892, Zahn corrected his earlier reconstruction on the basis of the Arabic Diatessaron ('Zu Tatians Diatessaron', in *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons,* ii/2 (Leipzig: Deichert, 1892), 530–50, esp. 546).

[48] The imperative 'go' seems to have been the reason why Leloir in his reconstruction of Ephraem's Diatessaron has wrongly assumed that the words belonged to v. 27 (L. Leloir, *Le Témoignage d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron* (Leuven: CSCO, 1962), 239, cf. 181–2): 'Ne autem offendas eis, *vade,* mitte rete in mare. *Da eis sicut alienus*'. However, the words are an addition to v. 26.

[49] Ch. 14: 17 (Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire, Arm.*, 196: 5–6).

[50] J. R. Harris, 'The First Tatian Reading in the Greek New Testament', *The Expositor,* 8/23 (Feb. 1922): 120–9, esp. 120–1; id., 'Cod. Ev. 561: Codex Algerinae Peckover', *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis,* 8/2 (1886), 79–89; see http://itsee.bham.ac.uk/parker/introduction/plates/plate51.htm.

[51] If Tatian had created this addition, it might perhaps indicate his inclination towards Gnosticism. Of course, it is also possible that he found the words of the addition in a source other than the four Gospels.

reading was chosen for the Syriac harmony, let alone for the underlying Greek harmony. Let me give an example of this problem. In John 3: 13 there is the much disputed phrase *ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, which is found in the majority of textual witnesses, but omitted in a few very early and important textual witnesses.[52] Zahn found only the short text in Ephraem's commentary.[53] This testimony was for later scholars a sufficient proof that the Diatessaron did not contain the words 'qui est in caelo'.[54] This in its turn could mean that Tatian had not read them in his Roman Gospel of John. However, Zahn was not convinced that Ephraem had preserved the correct text of the Diatessaron, for he added (between brackets) the following words: 'er, der im Himmel war'. He had found these words in a treatise of Aphrahat.[55] This author was a contemporary of Ephraem and most likely also had access to the Diatessaron. His quotation presents the verse including the words ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܒܫܡܝܐ, 'He who *was* in heaven';[56] this is also the text in Sy^{c} and in one manuscript of Sy^{p}. Now it is almost impossible to decide whether the Syriac Diatessaron contained these words or not: Ephraem might have neglected the pertinent phrase, because it was not necessary for his argument, *or* Aphrahat may have quoted here an Old Syriac text of John and not the Diatessaron. My personal conviction in this case is (1) that Ephraem most likely abbreviated the quotation of the text, and (2) that Tatian's Greek Diatessaron contained 'who is[57] in heaven'. If this is true, Tatian may be listed as

[52] See for the attestation the survey in K. Aland *et al.*, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften*, v/1, 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 46–8: they count besides the early Papyri ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$) and the important uncials א, B, and L, 13 other MSS; in favour of the addition of the phrase there are no less than 1,627 manuscripts, among which MSS A, *Δ*, *Θ*, *Ψ*, fam^{1} fam^{13}, and especially the Byzantine MSS.

[53] Zahn, *Diatessaron*, 183 (§62): 'Et nemo ascendit in caelum, nisi qui descendit de caelo, filius hominis'. He had found in the text of Aucher-Moesinger: 'Et: Nemo est, ait, qui ascendit in coelum. nisi qui et descendit de coelo, filius hominis' (ch. 14, p. 168: 2–4), 'Nemo ascendit in coelum, nisi, qui descendit de coelo, filius hominis' (ch. 16, p. 187: 22–3), 'Et nemo ascendit in coelum' (ibid. 187: 27), 'Qui descendit de coelo' (ibid. 188: 1–2), 'Et nemo est, qui ascendit in coelum, nisi qui descendit de eo, filius hominis' (ibid. 189: 4–6); this state of affairs is confirmed by the text in Leloir's edn of the Armenian commentary (14: 29, 203: 8–10; 14: 11, 227: 13–14, 17, 20, 24–5; 16: 13, 229: 7–8). The Syriac text (Leloir, 1963) confirms the lack of 'who is in heaven' (14: 29, 138: 12; 16: 11, 172: 14–15, 17, 19, 22; 16: 13, 174: 22–3).

[54] Cf. e.g. L. Leloir, *Le Témoignage d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron* (Leuven: CSCO, 1962), 242 (cf. 51, 197); cf. the apparatuses of several edns of the Greek text (e.g. in the UBS^{4} edn 1993): 'Diatessaron'.

[55] Cf. T. Baarda, *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat, the Persian Sage*, i. *Aphrahat's Text of the Fourth Gospel*, thesis defended 18 April 1975, at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (printed in Meppel, Krips Repro 1975), part i, esp. 87–91 (*Demonstration* 8: 9 (24)) and part ii, esp. 430–2.

[56] This solution of a problem (how can the Son of Man who is here be in heaven) is found in Rabbula, in the Persian Harmony (بود), Old Latin *e* (erat) an some Latin authors (cf. *Quotations*, i. 89).

[57] There is no reason to assume that the Syriac 'who was in heaven' presupposes the words *ὃς ἦν*, as Von Soden (*O.C.* ii. 399, 2nd app.), and Merk suggest (*Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine* (Rome, ^{9}1964), 314 app.: *ὃς ἦν*: e syci; cf. NA^{27} in loco); the reading ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ

the oldest witness to this text.[58] However, it is exactly such an example that shows how difficult it often is to give a final verdict about the Greek text of Tatian's harmony, let alone about the Greek text of the Gospels that he incorporated in his harmony. This relative uncertainty in the evaluation of the textual data should make it clear that we should be very cautious in using the name Tatian or Diatessaron in any apparatus to the Greek New Testament.

THE DIATESSARON IN A CRITICAL APPARATUS: MATTHEW 1 IN GNT$^{1-3}$

A long time ago, I was asked by W. C. van Unnik of Utrecht and R. P. Markham of the American Bible Society to provide all the textual Diatessaronic data for the apparatus of the first edition of the UBS Greek New Testament.[59] I really tried to fulfill that task, but after several months of study I had to withdraw: my investigation of the various texts involved[60] led me to the conclusion that it was not—or hardly—possible to arrive at a decisive conclusion about the precise text of the Diatessaron in many of the cases where it was required for the GNT apparatus. The reason was that I found too many conflicting readings in the witnesses of the Diatessaron. Others have done the work that I had abandoned with more or (rather) less success.[61]

In their first reference to the Diatessaron (Matt. 1: 11) the harmony is mentioned for the addition [*ἐγέννησεν*] *τὸν Ἰωακεὶμ, Ἰωακεὶμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν*. What is the source of the attribution of this 'addition' to Tatian? We know that there is strong evidence for the view that Tatian omitted the genealogies.[62]

(and 'erat' in Old Latin *e*) is merely a 'correction' to avoid the *logical* problem of the presence of the Son of Man both on earth and in heaven; the same is true for the reading *ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* in Greek Mss. 0141 80 315 397 821 2782 and in Sy^{s}.

58 Von Soden (*O.C.* ii. 399: add. *ο ων εν τω ουρανω* p. *ανθρ*. *Τα* K gg H exc $^{\delta 6\ 76f\ 376}$*Iφ*$^{c\ 190f}$ *Διδ Kυ* Or) apparently sees 'Tatian' (*Tα* = the Arabic Diatessaron) as the source of a corruption. In my view, one might reason that the omission is the result of logical reasoning (see n. 57) developed in Alexandria; this would explain why it is mainly found in 'Egyptian' texts like 𝔓^{66} 𝔓^{75} ℵ B L and in Coptic Versions (Sah, Boh, Subachm., Fayy.). It is my conviction that the longer text was the more original text, because it fits in with the Johannine idea that the earthly is the heavenly.

59 In that period I was adviser to the Dutch minister Dr Adolphine Bakker in the immense task she fulfilled by publishing the last three parts of the Liège harmony: D. Plooij, C. A. Phillips, and A. H. A. Bakker, *The Liège Diatessaron*, parts vi–viii (Amsterdam and London: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-maatschappij, 1963–70).

60 They had asked me to base my judgement not only on the Oriental witnesses (with which I had some experience) but also on the Western branch of the Diatessaron.

61 I am referring here to the data in the 1st–3rd UBS edns. (1966–75).

62 Cf. Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 41–2 (Theodoret of Cyrrhus). Even in the Arabic Diatessaron, in which they are found, the words are not present; Von Soden wisely omtted references to Tatian in the genealogy, except for v. 16, where he refers to the 'in *Tα*^{a} (a) angehängte Genealogie'.

How could he have had the addition in v. 11? What then was the editors' source? The editors also refer to Aphrahat;[63] did they guess that Aphrahat's Diatessaron contained the genealogy? In that case they should have mentioned either Diatessaron or Aphrahat, not both.

In Matt. 1: 18 we find in GNT$^{1-3}$ the Diatessaron as a witness for the reading *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and understandably so. Both the Armenian version of Ephraem's commentary and the Arabic Diatessaron read 'Jesus Christ'.[64] In 1966 the 'Valdevieso' fragment of Ephraem's commentary was published: it contains the reading: ܗܢܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܝܠܕܗ ܕܡܫܝܚ , 'The birth of the Messiah was thus'.[65] This reading was immediately incorporated in the reconstruction of the Diatessaron of Ortiz de Urbina,[66] but it was neglected in the UBS editions until its fourth edition.[67] Now the question remains which reading was that of the Syriac Diatessaron, the longer text[68] or the shorter text.[69] There is something in favour of the latter possibility,[70] but can we really be certain? In the same verse the Diatessaron is made a witness to *γέννησις*, but this attribution is highly questionable. The Syriac versions have ܝܠܕܐ , which can be used for *γένεσις* as well (cf. e.g. Peshitta in Gen. 40: 29, Hos. 2: 5). The fourth edition correctly removed the Diatessaron from the witnesses.

In the last verse (Matt. 1: 25) the Diatessaron is mentioned as a witness for the reading *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον* in all UBS editions. However, it should be noted that Ephraem's commentary, on which this identification was made, contained a slightly different text: '...until she gave birth to her first-born'.[71] The text reads only ܒܘܟܪܗ , 'her first-born', not 'her first-born

[63] They may have seen the addition in J. Parisot, *Aphraatis Sapientis Persae, Demonstrationes*, esp. *Demonstratio XXIII De Acino*, §21, in *Patrologia Syriaca*. i/2 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907), 65 (66): 13–26, 68(67): 1–4. However, it is uncertain whether the mentioning of both the names ܒܪ ܝܘܢܢ and ܒܪ ܝܚܢܢ is derived from Tatian's or Matthew's genealogy.

[64] Cf. Zahn, *Diatessaron*, 116 (117 n. 2); Leloir, *Témoignage*, 15; Von Soden mentions here: *Tα*, i.e. the Arabic Diatessaron, cf. Baarda, 'The Diatessaron of Tatian', 104–5.

[65] P. Ortiz Valdivieso, 'Un nuevo fragmento siriaco del Comentario de san Efrén al Diatésaron', *SPap* 5 (1966): 7–17.

[66] Ortiz de Urbina, *Vetus Evangeliorum Syrorum* (see n. 26 above), 13 (nr. 136), 210.

[67] The 2nd (1968) and 3rd (1975) edns. neglected this source, but it was in the *4th* edition (1993) that L. Leloir partly corrected it (p. 3), due to a new approach to the Diatessaron in this edn. (p. 38f.). But strangely enough, he mentions the reading 'Jesus Christ' in Diatessaron^{arm} but forgot to mention Diatessaron^{syr} for the reading 'Christ'. This shows again that apparatuses sometimes have their own problems.

[68] That is, the reading of (1) the Armenian version of Ephraem, if it represents a Syriac commentary with the longer reading, and (2) the Arabic Diatessaron—unless the latter text was influenced by the Peshitta and the first text was influenced by the Armenian Vulgate.

[69] The short text is also found in the Old Syriac version (Sy$^{s.c}$), a version possibly influenced by the Diatessaron, but one might reason that Ephraem had quoted here from the Old Syriac text, and not from his Diatessaron.

[70] I think of the fact that the short reading is found in (besides Sy$^{s.c}$) in Western texts (Old Latin, Vulgate, the Latin version of Irenaeus, and in Jerome and Augustine); it is often assumed that the Diatessaron was related in some way with the Syro-Latin text.

[71] Tr. C. McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron* (Oxford: OUP, 1993), 64–5; For the text: Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire* (1990), 6.1, 6, 10—The UBS

son'.[72] This may have been an adequate translation of the Greek expression, but it is also possible that the underlying Greek text of the Syriac Diatessaron did not contain the words *τὸν υἱόν*. Again it becomes clear that the search for Tatian's Greek text is a rather complicated one.

THE DIATESSARON IN A CRITICAL APPARATUS:- THE NEW APPROACH IN GNT[4]

It was a great improvement when the great scholar Leloir was made responsible for the Diatessaron data in the apparatus. It meant a great and salutary clean-up for the apparatus, because he restricted himself to the commentary of Ephraem. He abandoned all data found in other harmonies,[73] and confined himself to the Syriac commentary of Ephraem (Diatessaron[syr]) and its Armenian translation (Diatessaron[arm])[74]. This is to a certain extent an improvement, but it has also a disadvantage. An example may illustrate this: in John 10: 8 (*ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ*) Diatessaron[arm] is listed as witness to the inverted reading *πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἦλθον*, whereas only *ἦλθον* is attested for Diatessaron[syr]. Now it is up to the user of the apparatus to decide what the true text of the Diatessaron is! However, is the user able to do that without further research? Zahn gave in his reconstruction: 'Omnes qui *ante me* venerunt, fures erant et latrones', following his source.[75] The Armenian version reads յառաջ քան զիս, 'before me'.[76] The Syriac text, indeed, differs from the Armenian in that it reads 'All who came are thieves and robbers'[77] (without ܡܢ ܩܕܡܝ ,

apparatus does not mention the interesting variant reading for *καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτήν*: 'He lived with her chastely'.

[72] Cf. Sy[p]: ܠܒܪܗ ܒܘܟܪܐ ('her son first-born'; diff. Sy[s.c]: 'a/the son'). The Armenian text renders it consequently with անդրանիկ, 'first-born', only in one case the copyist of MS B added զ-որդին իւր, 'her son' (Leloir, *Commentaire (Arm.)*, 28.26 app.).

[73] Besides the Syriac (Diatessaron[e-syr]) and Armenian (Diatessarone-*arm*) texts in Ephraem's commentary, it listed the Arabic Harmony (Diatessaron[a]), the Persian Harmony (Diatessaron[p]), the Codex Fuldensis (Diatessaron[f]), the Italian harmonies (respectively Diatessaron[t /v]), and the Dutch texts (respectively Diatessaron[n, l, s]), without any description of their importance or their contribution to the search for the text of the Diatessaron.

[74] The committee thought that all information from later translations and revisions 'could only lead to confusion'; therefore they accepted only the earliest testimony, i.e. Ephraem, as witness, but 'the reader would be well advised, however, even for the citations derived from Ephraem's commentary, to be cautious in using the Diatessaron as a witness to the text of the New Testament' (GNT[4], 38–39).

[75] Zahn, *Diatessaron*, 191 (§71); cf. Aucher-Moesinger, *Expositio,* 200, cf. 209–10.

[76] Leloir, *Éphrem, Commentaire* (Arm.), 243.11–12 (16: 33); cf. 18: 5 (255: 10–12), 6 (255: 21 ff.).

[77] Leloir, *Éphrem, Commentaire* (Syr. 1963), 190: 19 (the other passages are not extant in the Syriac text); it is remarkable that Leloir ('Témoignage', 243) assumes that Tatian read *erant* in place of *sunt*. The Syriac text reads here ܐܢܘܢ , lit. 'they', which can mean both 'are' and 'were' (just as in Sy[s.p]). The varia lectio (*ἦσαν*) is found only in very few Greek MSS and in the

'before me')[78]. It is very likely that the Armenian translator was influenced here by the Armenian Vulgate (ed. Zohrab), which also reads 'before me', but one has to consider the theoretical possibility that Ephraem was influenced here by the text of the separate Syriac Gospel of John. In such a case, one might be tempted to look at the Arabic Diatessaron, whose reading وجميع لذين وافوا هم لُصوص وسُراق 'and all who came are thieves and robbers',[79] may perhaps confirm the omission of 'before me', in the Diatessaron, but then we also have to reckon with Peshitta influence on the Arabic tradition.

This example demonstrates that, although we may be pretty certain that the Diatessaron is a witness to the omission of 'before me', absolute certainty cannot be reached.

Still it must be acknowledged that Leloir's restriction to Diatessaron^{arm} and Diatessaron^{syr} is an improvement, compared with the previous UBS-editions. My suggestion would be to replace these names by Ephraem$^{com.arm}$ and Ephraem$^{com.syr}$, and only call the 'Diatessaron' to witness if there is no doubt that the reading was present in this work of Tatian.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE DIATESSARON

This contribution might give the impression that the present author is somewhat pessimistic about the contribution that the Diatessaron has to offer for the apparatus criticus of the Gospel text. And, indeed, it is my conviction that it is not possible to make the Diatessaron a standard witness in any apparatus. My basic assumption[80] is that in a major edition one should first concentrate on Greek evidence in the manuscripts, then add to it the Greek patristic testimony in a second apparatus. The versions should follow then in a separate apparatus. It is true, versions may contribute to the establishing of a text, but they sometimes require interpretation to determine which word or phrase actually stood in the Greek text.[81] The Diatessaron, then, could have been an

Armenian Vulgate (էին), a reading and also once in the Armenian Ephraem (243: 12; however, 255: 21 են, 'are').

[78] These words are also omitted in Sy$^{s.p.pal}$, and *sub asterico* in Sy^{h}. GNT[4] lists 𝔓[45] 𝔓[75] א Δ E F G 0141 28 180 892supp 1010 1292 1342 1424 as Greek witnesses for the omission.

[79] Marmardji, *Diatessaron*, 352: 1 (37: 11).

[80] 'What Kind of Critical Apparatus for the New Testament do we Need? The Case of Luke 23: 48', in B. Aland and J. Delobel, *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History* (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994), 37–97.

[81] Especially, if a translation itself was result of another translation: did the Armenian text go back to a Greek text or a Syriac translation, was the Georgian version made directly from the Greek text or was it also influenced by the Armenian version? The Ethiopic version shows an even more composite character.

important witness, if we possessed it in its original Greek form,[82] but even its Syriac version has disappeared. We have only references to this text in the newly found Syriac fragments of Ephraem's commentary[83] and in the two manuscripts of the Armenian translation, then most likely also in the treatises of Aphrahat[84] and perhaps in a few other early Syriac works. Further, there is also the Arabic version of Tatian's harmony, but its manuscripts do not always agree in their presentation of the Gospel text. In short, it is a long and risky road along which one has to travel to reach the goal, the reconstruction of the readings in the Syriac Diatessaron, and a longer road if one wants to find their Greek equivalents in the harmony, even more the readings in the Greek Gospel texts behind this harmony. That is the reason why one has to be very cautious in attributing the label 'Diatessaron' to a specific Greek (variant) reading in the apparatus, even if one might be quite certain that Tatian had read that reading or perhaps created it.[85] It would be a challenge for the future to make a new attempt at reconstructing the Diatessaron! Such an attempt requires not only students with an ability in languages, but also with the scientific acumen that Theodor Zahn possessed when he prepared his edition of the first reconstruction of Tatian's Diatessaron that appeared long ago in 1881.[86]

[82] Of course, there would still be the problem: in cases of non-Johannine material, we would have to decide from which individual Gospel its text was borrowed in each verse.

[83] It should be taken into account that we have only one MS, and so we do not know whether other MSS had deviations from its text.

[84] There are mainly two MSS which sometimes differ in their presentation of the Gospel text; both MSS can differ from the original text which has been preserved in translation, cf. T. Baarda, 'Another Treatise of Aphrahat the Persian Sage in Ethiopic Translation', *NTS* 27 (1980–1): 632–40.

[85] One should limit oneself to the sources that are relevant for establishing Tatian's text, esp. Ephraem's Commentary (Syriac and/or Armenian), Aphrahat and other Syriac authors, and the Arabic Diatessaron; in this chapter I have left aside the Western Diatessaron traditions, because they have a history of their own which deserves a separate treatment.

[86] Despite all new discoveries, later attempts to reconstruct Ephraem's Diatessaron (Hill-Robinson, Leloir) or Tatian's Diatessaron (Ortiz de Urbina) have not brought us a new Zahn. In a new attempt the Arabic Diatessaron, which was published after 1881, should not be neglected.

19

Early Apocryphal Gospels and the New Testament Text

Stanley E. Porter

INTRODUCTION

There is a range of apocryphal literature potentially informative regarding the text of the Greek New Testament. In the latest major edition of these apocryphal documents in English translation, J. K. Elliott organizes this diffuse body of literature according to genre. His categories include: apocryphal gospels, apocryphal acts, apocryphal epistles, and apocryphal apocalypses.[1] However, a closer examination of this literature makes clear that only a limited number of texts is relevant for a study of the Greek text of the New Testament, if—as is the case in this volume—one is examining the Greek text as it developed in the second and third centuries, before the rise in the fourth century of the major codices. Much of the literature falls outside the temporal parameters established above, some of it being written quite late. Other apocryphal texts thought to be early are only known indirectly through reference or quotation by other, later authors. Still others of these texts are not in Greek, but in a variety of other languages, the most frequent being Latin, Coptic, or Syriac, thus compromising their use in analysis of the Greek text. Others of these apocryphal texts do not significantly reflect any New Testament book, and so provide at best only incidental reference to the Greek New Testament. Finally, there are texts that meet all of the requisite criteria that I have noted above regarding date and Greek language, but simply do not quote the Greek New Testament. By far the majority of apocryphal literature is not germane to this particular exercise of textual exploration, and does not

[1] J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), whose information is drawn upon, esp. for dates, general background, and bibliography. See also Joseph van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus litteraires juifs et chretiens* (Paris: Sorbonne, 1976).

provide much promise of apocryphal literature informing our knowledge of the text of the Greek New Testament.

However, there is still some apocryphal literature—even if the quantity is smaller than one might desire—that can be drawn upon to inform our understanding.[2] Not surprisingly, the apocryphal writings that provide the best opportunity for exploring the state of the early New Testament text are gospels. Therefore, while apocryphal acts and apocryphal apocalypses have some value in this regard, we shall use our limited space to examine the relevant apocryphal gospels from our period. Although there has been significant recent discussion of the relationship between a number of these apocryphal texts and the New Testament, through presentation of the respective texts it becomes clear that the preponderance of evidence indicates that these apocryphal texts are dependent upon the Greek New Testament. Brief comments are made for each text in order to illustrate the state of discussion, before presenting the respective parallels and offering brief commentary where appropriate or needed on plausible textual relations.

THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT IN THE EARLY APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS

A number of apocryphal gospels provide evidence of the early text of the Greek New Testament. However, most of these are gospel-like texts found only in various fragmentary papyri (including the *Gospel of Peter*). The exception is the *Protevangelium of James*, which has a number of quotations. I will treat these fragmentary Greek apocryphal gospel texts first, and then examine the *Protevangelium of James*.

Before I undertake this close examination, a word needs to be said about the texts and how they are presented. The quality of the texts involved varies considerably, depending upon the number of manuscripts available, their date and condition, and the extent of text readable. The major task of this exercise is to provide evidence of the state of the text of the New Testament in these apocryphal documents, and so the minimal unit of examination is usually groups of words, not single words and certainly not individual letters. Thus, the readings from the various documents will be presented without indication of the uncertainty of each letter, except as that affects possible textual comparison. The use of groups of words is appropriate in order to illustrate the

[2] In what follows, I draw directly upon previous research that I have done in this area: S. E. Porter, 'Apocryphal Gospels and the Text of the New Testament before A.D. 200', in C.-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott, eds., *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity/Le Texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), 235–58.

relatively early fixed state of the text of the New Testament as the source text utilized by the apocryphal documents.

Fragmentary Greek Apocryphal Gospels

In 1997, I published an article in which I noted the general lack of good-quality recent editions of the Greek texts of these apocryphal gospels, and called for the production of newly edited editions of these valuable but difficult and fragmentary texts so that renewed analysis could take place.[3] The last ten years or so have seen a great resurgence of interest in these documents. Besides a number of new translations, there have been numerous publication efforts to bring forth new Greek editions. I will refer to these new editions in the discussions below. There are six fragmentary Greek gospel texts to consider, because they cite the text of the Greek New Testament.

Gospel of Peter[4]

The Akhmim manuscript of the *Gospel of Peter* has been variously dated (especially to seventh to ninth centuries), but the latest research by Kraus and Nicklas indicates the seventh century. If this is the *Gospel of Peter* referred to by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 6.12.1–6), and some have doubts, its date of composition may have been in the second half of the second century.

The outline of the *Gospel of Peter* clearly follows the story of Jesus in the canonical Gospels, but also includes additional material. There are also numerous places where, besides reflecting the overarching narrative of the

[3] S. E. Porter, 'The Greek Apocryphal Gospels Papyri: The Need for a Critical Edition', in B. Kramer *et al.*, eds., *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.–19.8.1995* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1997), 795–803.

[4] I use the edn. and critical information found in T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, eds., *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), including 32–49. The *editio princeps* is M. U. Bouriant, 'Fragments du texte grec du livre d'Enoch et de quelques écrits attributes à Saint Pierre', *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire*, 9/1 (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892), 137–42; with a facsimile in A. Lods, 'L'Évangile et l'Apocalypse de Pierre: Le Texte grec du livre d'Enoch', *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire*, 9/3 (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1893), 216–24. There have been many subsequent edns., important ones being H. B. Swete, *ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΠΕΤΡΟΝ: The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1893); L. Vaganay, *L'Évangile de Pierre* (Paris: Gabalda, 1930); and M. G. Mara, *Évangile de Pierre* (Paris: Cerf, 1973). For information on the *Gospel of Peter*, besides the above, see Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 150–2; J. H. Charlesworth and C. A. Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', in B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, eds., *Studying the Historical Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 479–533, esp. 503–14; A. Bernhard, *Other Early Christian Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 49–52; P. Foster, 'The *Gospel of Peter*', in P. Foster, ed., *The Non-Canonical Gospels* (London: Continuum, 2008), 30–42.

Gospels, individual words in the *Gospel of Peter* overlap in the appropriate place within the flow of the narrative. These allusions encompass all of the Synoptic Gospels, and arguably John's Gospel as well.[5]

The following are places where the wording of the canonical Gospels can be identified in the Akhmim document (P.Cairensis 10759, but with reference where appropriate to P. Oxyrhynchus XLI 2949, a second- or third-century fragment).[6] I do not include allusive instances where the texts have one or two words in common.

1.1: *ἐνίψατο τὰς χεῖρας*; GNT: *ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας* (Matt. 27: 24), with the prefixed form in the Greek New Testament, possibly indicating an earlier source.[7]

2.3: *ἦλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πειλᾶτον καὶ ᾔτησε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κύριου*; GNT: *εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πιλᾶτον καὶ ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (Mark 15: 43 and pars.), with the prefixed form in the Greek New Testament. P. Oxyrhynchus XLI 2949, fragment 1 ll. 7–9, seems to have the same portion, but is not as close to the Gospel texts as P. Cairensis 10759.[8]

2.5: *σάββατον ἐπίφωσκει*; GNT: *σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν* (Luke 23: 54)

4.13: *εἷς δὲ τις τῶν κακούργων*; GNT: *εἷς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων* (Luke 23: 39), with the redundant pronoun in the *Gospel of Peter*

5.19: *κατέλειψάς με*; GNT: *ἐγκατέλιπές με*; (Mark 15: 34), with the longer prefixed form in the Greek New Testament, leaving only the much later minuscule manuscript 124 having the same verb form as in the *Gospel of Peter*

5.20 and GNT: *τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ* (Mark 15: 38; Matt. 27: 51)

[5] See H. von Schubert, *The Gospel of St. Peter: Synoptical Tables, with Translation and Critical Apparatus*, tr. J. Macpherson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1893), 4–29. The Johannine allusions are disputed by P. Gardner-Smith, 'The Gospel of Peter', *JTS* 27 (1925–6): 255–71, esp. 256–69. However, Gardner-Smith only responds to the suggestions of J. Armitage Robinson and M. Rhodes James (*The Gospel according to Peter, and the Revelation of Peter* (London: Clay & Sons, 1892)), and not Schubert. He does not address the possibilities of *Gos.Pet.* 3 and John 19: 38; *Gos.Pet.* 7 and John 19: 3; *Gos.Pet.* 11 and John 19: 19; *Gos.Pet.* 17 and John 19: 30.

[6] I do not consider P.Oxyrhynchus LX 4009, P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325, or P.Egerton 2 to be parts of the *Gospel of Peter*, but am willing to entertain that P.Oxyrhynchus XLI 2949 may be a part. See P. Foster, 'Are there Any Early Fragments of the So-Called *Gospel of Peter*?', *NTS* 52/1 (2006): 1–28, for a study of the relevant documents. I do not think that his conclusion is affected by the recent effort to decipher the verso of P.Oxyrhynchus LX 4009 by Matti Myllykoski, in 'The Sinful Woman in the *Gospel of Peter*: Reconstructing the Other Side of P.Oxy. 4009', *NTS* 55/1 (2009): 104–15.

[7] Some might be tempted to think that the unprefixed verbal form indicates an earlier form of the verb to which a prefix was later added. My recent research on relations between Greek texts where source dependence is known preliminarily indicates that the opposite is true—the receptor text tends to delete the prefixed preposition (as in 1.1 and 2.3, as well as 5.19). See S. E. Porter, 'Verbal Aspect and Synoptic Relations' (forthcoming).

[8] The fragmentary P.Oxyrhynchus XLI 2949, fragment 1 lines 7–9, reads: *ἐλ]θὼν πρὸς Πειλᾶτο[ν ...]τὸ σῶμα εἰς ταφήν [... Ἡρῴδ]ην ᾐτήσα[το.*

6.21: *ἡ γῆ πᾶσα ἐσείσθη*; GNT: *ἡ γῆ ἐσείσθη* (Matt. 27: 51), with the more emphatic usage in the *Gospel of Peter*

7.27: *πενθοῦντες καὶ κλαίοντες*; GNT: *πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν* (Mark 16: 10), noting that this phrase appears in the longer added ending of Mark's Gospel, which dates no earlier than the second century[9]

8.30: *τρεῖς ἡμέρας, μήποτε ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κλέψωσιν αὐτὸν καὶ*; GNT: *τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας, μήποτε ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κλέψωσιν αὐτὸν καὶ* (Matt. 27: 64)

11.45: *ἀληθῶς υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ*; GNT: *ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν* (Mark 15: 39), where arguably the *Gospel of Peter* has eliminated reference to Jesus as a human

12.53: *τίς δὲ ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν καὶ τὸν λίθον τὸν τεθέντα ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου*; GNT: *τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου*; (Mark 16: 3)

12.55: *καὶ προσελθοῦσαι παρέκυψαν ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁρῶσιν ἐκεῖ τινα νεανίσκον καθεζόμενον μέσωι τοῦ τάφου ὡραῖον καὶ περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν*; GNT: *καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν* (Mark 16: 5).

The question of the relationship of the *Gospel of Peter* to the New Testament has been highly contentious in some circles.[10] The evidence above indicates that, even though some may posit a Cross Gospel as a separate source, the New Testament Greek text appears to be used in a similar way in both the entire *Gospel of Peter* and the embedded so-called Cross Gospel. Further, at least one of the passages cited in the supposed Cross Gospel (e.g. 5.19) seems to indicate a later textual tradition. Here, however, I focus on the passages in the *Gospel of Peter* and the canonical Gospels where there is textual overlap. First, the *Gospel of Peter* seems to be derived from the canonical Gospel accounts (e.g. 5.19, 7.27), but does not follow any one of the canonical Gospels in its text. Secondly, the *Gospel of Peter* does not appear to quote the canonical Gospels at any significant length, but seems to use the narrative and the major events to create its own account, adding further material such as the talking cross, the lament of several groups, and the closing episode with Peter—what might well be argued are strong indications of later added material. Thirdly, the *Gospel of Peter* appears to have had access to all of the Synoptic Gospels,

[9] D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 124–47.

[10] The major advocate for an early form of the *Gospel of Peter* is John Dominic Crossan. His major works on this topic are: *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988); *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991); *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995). For assessment of his arguments, see Charlesworth and Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', 504–14.

and quotes from each of them (and possibly alludes to the Gospel of John). Fourthly, despite the narrative similarity and the several quotations, the influence of the canonical Gospels on specific textual material is surprisingly sparse. Fifthly, there are a number of small variants that point to a later and more developed text in the *Gospel of Peter*. These include the use of 'Lord' instead of 'Jesus' (2.3), the use of a form of the verb that is only found in a much later manuscript (5.19), and the tendency for subordination and fuller expression (12.53, 55). There is nothing here that indicates that this text precedes the canonical Gospels, and plenty of evidence—narratively and textually—that it follows the canonical Gospels for the shape of its narrative and for the substance of several passages. The evidence is admittedly small, but it appears that the *Gospel of Peter*, at those few places where it cites the Greek New Testament, is citing an earlier form of the text, and introducing features that indicate its derivative and later form.

The Egerton papyrus[11]

The Egerton papyrus has been contested recently regarding date of composition and of copying. The manuscript was probably copied in the middle of the second century, even if the text itself was composed in the early to mid part of the century.[12] As noted above, there are various opinions on the relation of the Egerton papyrus to the canonical Gospels, with some arguing for its use of all of the four Gospels and others arguing that it attests to a time when Synoptic and Johannine traditions existed side by side.[13]

The text of the Egerton papyrus (in which I am including the original P.Egerton 2 and the fragment now housed in Cologne, P. Köln VI 255) consists of four major episodes. Episodes one, two, and four reflect, I believe, accounts found in the canonical Gospels, while the third does not reflect a

[11] I follow the latest edn. by T. Nicklas in T. J. Kraus *et al.*, *Gospel Fragments* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 11–120. Other significant edns. of P.Egerton 2 include H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri* (London: British Museum, 1935), 1–41 (*editio princeps*); *The New Gospel Fragments* (London: British Museum, 1935; corr. edns., 1951, 1955); G. Mayeda, *Das Leben-Jesu-Fragment* (Bern: Paul Haupt, 1946); of P.Köln 255, M. Gronewald, 'Unbekanntes Evangelium oder Evangelienharmonie (Fragment aus dem 'Evangelium Egerton')', in M. Gronewald *et al.*, eds., *Kölner Papyri*, 6 (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1987), 136–45 (*editio princeps* for this additional fragment). For information on the Egerton papyrus that I draw on below, besides the above, see Bell and Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*, 1–41; *New Gospel Fragments*; Charlesworth and Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', 514–32; Bernhard, *Other Early Christian Gospels*, 84–7; and T. Nicklas, 'Papyrus Egerton 2', in Foster, ed., *Non-Canonical Gospels*, 139–49.

[12] See S. E. Porter, 'Recent Efforts to Reconstruct Early Christianity on the Basis of its Papyrological Evidence', paper delivered at the 26th International Congress of Papyrology, 16–21 Aug. 2010, University of Geneva; Nicklas in Kraus *et al.*, *Gospel Fragments*, 113–14.

[13] Besides Nicklas, see H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (London: SCM, 1990), 207; Charlesworth and Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', 514–25.

specific canonical Gospel account. Thus, we shall focus on episodes one, two, and four in our discussion below.

(*a*) The first episode (fragment 1 verso) reflects a confrontation between Jesus and experts in the law. The following passages reflect the text of John's Gospel within this episode.

P. Egerton 2, fragment 1 verso ll. 7–10: *ἐραυ||[νᾶτε τ]ὰς γραφάς· ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς δο||[κεῖτε] ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐκεῖναί εἰ[σ]ιν | [αἱ μαρτ]υροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ*; GNT: *ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ* (John 5: 39)

This Egerton text is very similar to that of John's Gospel, with the following variants: P.Egerton 2 has the relative construction *ἐν αἷς* instead of the Johannine *ὅτι*, but Egerton does not have *ἐν αὐταῖς*, *αἰώνιον*, or *καὶ*, all found in John's Gospel. John's Gospel never uses the preposition *ἐν* and a plural relative pronoun, phrasing characteristic of the Synoptic Gospels. Egerton appears to be smoothing the syntax of John's Gospel to conform to synoptic wording. The other features—use of *ζωὴν* with or without modification or use of the conjunction *καὶ* versus asyndeton—are both found in John's Gospel and therefore do not indicate textual development either way.

P. Egerton 2, fragment 1 verso ll. 10–14: *μὴ ν[ομί||ζετε ὅ]τι ἐγὼ ἦλθον κατηγο[ρ]ῆσαι | [ὑμῶν] πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου· ἔστιν | [ὁ κατη]γορῶν ὑμῶν Μωϋσῆς εἰς ὃν ||[ὑμεῖς] ἠλπίκατε*; GNT: *μὴ δοκεῖτε ὅτι ἐγὼ κατηγορήσω ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε* (John 5: 45)

P.Egerton 2 uses the verb *νομίζω* but John uses *δοκέω*; Egerton uses the compound construction with *ἦλθον κατηγο[ρ]ῆσαι* but John uses the simplex form *κατηγορήσω*; and Egerton has the genitive modifier *μου* not found in John. The verb *νομίζω* is not used in any of the Johannine writings, but is used in the Synoptic Gospels, in the same compound verbal construction as Egerton uses in fragment 1 l. 11 (see Matt. 5: 17). Egerton seems to be accommodating to the Synoptic Gospels. Egerton, however, does appear to have readings that are earlier than the Western tradition. Egerton has *ὑμῶν* in l. 13 rather than *ὑμᾶς* in D* and 1424, or *ὑμῖν* in $\mathfrak{P}^{75*}$ or L.

P.Egerton 2, fragment 1 verso ll. 15–17: *ὅ[τι] οἴδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσεῖ ἐλά||[λησεν] ὁ θεός·σὲ δὲ οὐκ οἴδαμεν | [πόθεν εἶ]*; GNT: *ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσεῖ λελάληκεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν* (John 9: 29)

P.Egerton 2 has *ὅ[τι]*[14] while John has the pronoun *ἡμεῖς*; Egerton uses the aorist indicative verb form *ἐλάλησεν* while John uses the perfect indicative *λελάληκεν*, a possible case of tense-form reduction; and Egerton (though there is no text remaining on line 17) uses the second person rather than the third

14 Earlier edns. read *εὖ*, an adverb not used in any of the Johannine writings.

person found in John. The use of the perfect tense-form is characteristic of John's Gospel, with it appearing over twice as frequently per thousand words in John's Gospel (15 ×) than it does in the other Gospels (Matthew 5 × , Mark and Luke 7 × each). The aorist form is found in Alexandrinus and several later manuscripts (S and *Θ*). The use of the second person to speak of Jesus only occurs in John's Gospel at 19: 9, but the third person is used a number of times, so Egerton appears to have eliminated a Johannine characteristic and thus to have changed John's Gospel to conform to synoptic wording. Nevertheless, Egerton appears to be earlier or independent of the Western tradition, which adds additional words after *θεός* in D.

> P.Egerton 2, fragment 1 verso ll. 20–3 (P.Köln 255 verso ll. 2–5): *εἰ γὰρ ἐπι*|[*στεύσατε Μωϋσεῖ*]; *ἐπιστεύσατε ἄ*[*ν*] | [*ἐμοί; πε*]*ρ*[*ὶ*] *ἐμοῦ γὰρ ἐκεῖνο*[*ς*] | [*ἔγραψε*]*ν*; GNT: *εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί, περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν* (John 5: 46).

P.Egerton 2 uses the aorist indicative, certainly in the clearly readable portion of text and probably in the earlier one as well, in light of the parallelism found in John 5: 46. Egerton has the connective *γὰρ* after the entire word group *περὶ ἐμοῦ*, while John has the conjunction between the preposition and its head term. The use of the aorist tense-forms is found in two later manuscripts, L and 1424, and the placement of the conjunction is the same as in D. The comments to Jesus in P.Egerton 2, fragment 1 verso ll. 15–17, reflect John 9: 29, but Jesus' answer in ll. 20–3 reflects John 5: 46, a conflation of Johannine texts.[15]

(*b*) The second episode (fragment 1 recto) depicts an event in which the leaders attempt to arrest and hand Jesus over to the crowd, possibly to be stoned, but he slips out of their hands. Then a leper comes to him, who wishes to be clean, and Jesus heals him and tells him to go to the priests. The number of Gospel passages found in these two episodes is surprisingly large.

> P.Egerton 2, fragment 1 recto ll. 3–8: *καὶ ἐπέβαλεν* [*τὰς*] | *χεῖ*[*ρας*] *αὐτῶν ἐπ' αὐτὸν οἱ* [*ἄρχον*]|*τες* [*ἵν*]*α πιάσωσιν καὶ παρ*[|..[..]*τῷ ὄχλῳ καὶ οὐκ ἠ*[*δύναντο*] | *αὐτὸν πιάσαι ὅτι οὔπω ἐ*[*ληλύθει*] | *αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα τῆς παραδό*[*σεως*]; GNT: *καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπέβαλεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὴν χεῖρα, ὅτι οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ* (John 7: 30); *καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπίασεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ* (John 8: 20); *τινὲς δὲ ἤθελον ἐξ αὐτῶν πιάσαι αὐτόν, ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς ἐπέβαλεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας* (John 7: 44).

There are two sets of variants to note here. The first are global variants. The major difference in word order between P.Egerton 2 and John 7: 30 has Egerton using a *ἵνα* clause to indicate purpose, while John 7: 30 uses a paratactic structure. John 7: 30 also has a catenative constructive rather than the subjunctive, but Egerton uses a catenative construction down in ll. 6–7 where John 8: 20 uses a simplex form. The other global variant concerns the

[15] Noted by Charlesworth and Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', 516.

lengthier treatment of the episode in Egerton, in which the rulers are designated as those who lay hands upon Jesus but who are then unable to strike him. The Johannine accounts are more tersely written and simply say no one was able to lay hands on him or strike him. Egerton is an apparent conflation of the several separate Johannine passages. This is similar to what is found in minuscule 28 from the eleventh century.

The second type of variant includes specific wordings. Egerton specifies the agents involved in the action as the 'rulers', while the Johannine passages designate that 'no one' was able to lay hands on or strike Jesus. Egerton has complement-adjunct word order in ll. 1–2 while John 7: 30 has adjunct-complement. Egerton in l. 8 uses a further explicit genitive modifier while John 7: 30 and 8: 20 use the intensive pronoun *αὐτοῦ*. The explicit genitive modifier, *παράδοσις*, is not used elsewhere in the New Testament with the sense of betrayal.

The specific variants support the global variants that indicate that the Egerton passage is a conflation and expansion of the Johannine passages.

> P.Egerton 2, fragment 1 recto ll. 11–12: *καὶ [ἰ]δοὺ λεπρὸς προσελθ[ὼν αὐτῷ] | λέγει*; GNT: *καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων* (Matthew 8: 2a).

P.Egerton 2 reflects fairly typical Synoptic Gospel syntax, with the aorist participle preceding the finite verb of speaking, while Matthew uses a finite verb and a following adverbial participle of speaking.

> P.Egerton 2, fragment 1 recto ll. 15–16: *ἐὰν [ο]ὖν [σὺ θέλῃς] | καθαρίζομαι*; GNT: *ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι* (Mark 1: 40b; Matt. 8: 2b; Luke 5: 12b).

P.Egerton 2 uses the conjunction *οὖν*, not found in the passages from the Synoptic Gospels; the second person singular in Egerton is a reconstruction, even if plausible; and the catenative construction is used instead of a simplex form. All of these variants point to later attempts to refine the style of the Synoptic authors in Egerton.

> P.Egerton 2, fragment 1 recto ll. 16–18: *ὁ δὴ κύριος [ἔφη αὐτῷ.] | θέλ[ω] καθαρίσθητι· [καὶ εὐθέως] | [ἀ]πέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπ[ρα*; GNT: *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη* (Mark 1: 41–2);... *λέγων, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα* (Matt. 8: 3);... *λέγων, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* (Luke 5: 13).

There are two questionable textual reconstructions of P.Egerton 2 in this passage. It is possible that *λέγει* and *εὐθὺς* should be read in the reconstruction. In the first, the verb probably could have been used without the intensive pronoun, the reading found in Sinaiticus, W and some minuscules. In the second, either is a possibility according to the Synoptic evidence.

As for the variants themselves, Egerton has an explicit subject, *κύριος*, lacking in the Synoptic Gospels; Egerton and Mark 1: 41b use the finite

verb, but both Matt. 8: 3 and Luke 5: 13 use the participle; Egerton has the verb *ἀπέστη*, while Matt. 8: 3 has *ἐκαθαρίσθη* (cf. D* with this reading at Luke 5: 13) and Luke 5: 13 has *ἀπῆλθεν*, and Mark has both; P.Egerton 2, Mark 1: 42, and Matt. 8: 3 all have predicator-subject word order, while Luke 5: 13 has subject-predicator in most manuscripts (C and 579 have this in Mark, but a number of other Lukan manuscripts have predicator-subject order).

In these variants, Egerton apparently follows Markan syntax, while also displaying the same tendency as the Synoptics in selecting one of the two verbs regarding leprosy, although the verb selected, *ἀπέστη*, is not found in either the Matthean or Lukan account. The verb, however, is Lukan. The explicit subject is characteristic of Egerton, which feature occurs on other occasions.

> P.Egerton 2, fragment 1 recto ll. 18–23 (P.Köln 255 recto 1–5): *λέγει] | δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πορε[υθεὶς σεαυ]|τὸν ἐπίδειξον τοῖ[ς ἱερεῦσιν] | καὶ ἀνένεγκον [περὶ τοῦ κα]|[θ]αρισμοῦ ὡς προ[σ]έ[ταξεν Μωϋσῆς καὶ] | [μ]ηκέτι ἁ[μά]ρτανε*; GNT: *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς, ἀλλὰ ὕπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς* (Mark 1:44); *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὅρα μηδενὶ εἴπῃς, ἀλλὰ ὕπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκον τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς* (Matthew 8: 4); *καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς* (Luke 5: 14); *Πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν* (cf. Luke 17: 14).

P.Egerton 2 and Matthew have an explicit subject, while Luke has a reduced form (intensive pronoun) and Mark has none; the word order is predicator-complement-subject in Egerton, Matthew, and Luke, but predicator-complement in Mark; Egerton uses the conjunction *δὲ* but the Gospels all use *καὶ*; Egerton does not have the words of warning that the Gospels have followed by the adversative conjunction; Egerton and Luke 5: 14 each has a different aorist participle of motion, while Mark and Matthew have the syntactically awkward imperative *ὕπαγε*; Egerton, Mark and Matthew have reflexive pronoun-imperative ordering, but Luke has the opposite; Egerton has the verb *ἀνένεγκον* while all of the Synoptics have *προσένεγκον/κε*; Egerton has *καθαρισμοῦ* with Mark and Luke, while Matthew has *τὸ δῶρον*; Egerton uses the conjunction *ὡς* similarly to the use of *καθὼς* in Luke 5: 14, while Mark 1: 44 and Matt. 8: 4 use a relative clause; Egerton uses an imperative clause (*ἁ[μά]ρτανε*), while all three of the Synoptic Gospels use a prepositional phrase with *εἰς*. At a number of points Egerton seems to follow Luke's Gospel, although this is not always the case. In fact, Egerton draws upon all three of the Synoptic Gospels.

(*c*) The fourth episode, fragment 2 recto, contains a single scene reflective of three Gospel episodes—rendering to Caesar, found in all three Synoptics (Mark 12: 13–17; Matthew 22: 15–22; Luke 20: 20–6); calling Jesus teacher; and honoring him with their lips.

P.Egerton 2, fragment 2 recto ll. 3–6: *διδάσκαλε Ἰησοῦ οἴδαμεν ὅτι [ἀπὸ θεοῦ] | ἐλήλυθας; ἃ γὰρ ποιεῖς μα[ρτυρεῖ] | ὑπὲρ το[ὺ]ς προφήτας πάντας*; GNT: *Ῥαββί, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος; οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ* (John 3: 2); *τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ* (John 10: 25).

Features of P.Egerton 2 resemble both John 3: 2 and John 10: 25. Egerton has a relative clause similar in phrasing to both Johannine passages, as well as using the verb *μαρτυρεῖ* as in John 10: 25. Egerton, however, also has its typical compound title of address of Jesus, *διδάσκαλε Ἰησοῦ*, which is not found in either the Synoptic Gospels or John's Gospel (though it has some resemblance to Mark 12: 14), but is found elsewhere in Egerton. The Egerton form of address does not use the transliterated Semiticism *Ῥαββί*, but instead uses a Greek equivalent, *διδάσκαλε*. The Egerton passage appears to be a conflation of the two Johannine passages, with some possible influence of Mark 12: 14.

P.Egerton 2, fragment 2 recto ll. 7–9: *ἐξὸν τοῖς βασιλεῦσ[ιν ἀποδοῦ]|ναι τὰ ἀν[ή]κοντα τῇ ἀρχῇ ἀπ[οδῶμεν αὐ]τοῖς ἢ μ[ή]*; GNT: *ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὔ; δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν*; (Mark 12: 14b); *ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὔ*; (Matt. 22: 17b); *ἔξεστιν ἡμᾶς Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι ἢ οὔ*; (Luke 20: 22).

Variants between P.Egerton 2 and the Synoptics include use of *ἐξὸν* in Egerton and *ἔξεστιν* in the Synoptics; the use of several prefixed verbal forms in Egerton (e.g. *ἀποδοῦ]|ναι, ἀν[ή]κοντα, ἀπ[οδῶμεν*), as opposed to simplex forms in the Gospels; the use in Egerton of the intensive pronoun in l. 9, not used in the Synoptics; and the use of *μὴ* rather than *οὔ* in Egerton as opposed to the Synoptics. The Synoptic accounts themselves differ considerably, with Matthew's shorter version and the single phrasing of Luke's version rather than the two phrases in Mark's. Egerton's double phrasing resembles Mark most closely, but it does not retain the double negative construction. Egerton also seems to have Alexandrian phrasing (e.g. the use of the accusative absolute with *ἐξὸν*, the use of *μὴ* as the negative particle with non-indicative verb forms, and the use of prefixed forms). The unparalleled phrasing of Egerton resembles Luke 20: 20 (*παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ*), and thus, despite the use of the prefixed verbal forms, the Egerton papyrus is probably a Lukan-based conflation of Gospel passages.

P.Egerton 2, fragment 2 recto ll. 11–13: *τί με καλεῖτ[ε τῷ στό]|ματι ὑμ[ῶν δι]δάσκαλον; μ[ὴ ἀκού]|οντες ὃ [λ]έγω*; GNT: *Τί δέ με καλεῖτε, Κύριε κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ὃ λέγω*; (Luke 6: 46).

Variants[16] include use of the conjunction *καὶ* in Luke 6: 46; the instrumental phrase (*τῷ στό]|ματι*; 'by mouth') in Egerton; the difference between calling

[16] I follow 𝔓75 B and A with the neuter singular rather than neuter plural relative pronoun in Luke 6: 46.

Jesus teacher and Lord; and the use of the participial construction in Egerton but parataxis in Luke 6: 46. Egerton appears to be an expanded and more hypotactic version of Luke's Gospel.

P.Egerton 2, fragment 2 recto ll. 13–18: *καλῶς Ἠ[σαΐας περὶ ὑ]||μῶν ἐπ[ρο]φήτευσεν εἰπών· ὁ [λαὸς οὗ]||τος τοῖς [χείλ]εσιν αὐτ[ῶν τιμῶσιν] | με ἡ [δὲ καρδί]α αὐτῶ[ν πόρρω ἀπέ]||χει ἀπ' ἐ[μοῦ· μ]άτη[ν (δὲ) σέβονταί με] | ἐντάλ[ματα;* GNT: *καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἠσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ὅτι Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων* (Mark 7: 6–7); *καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἠσαΐας λέγων, Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ* (Matthew 15: 7–8).

This passage involves both the relationship between P.Egerton 2 and the Synoptic Gospels and the relationship to Isa. 29: 13, which is quoted in all the sources involved. Egerton ll. 13–14 has subject-predicator word order, but Mark 7: 6 and Matt. 15: 7 predicator-subject; Egerton does not use the words *τῶν ὑποκριτῶν*, as does Mark 7: 6 but not Matt. 15: 7; Egerton introduces Isaiah's quotation with a participle, while Mark uses a common Synoptic formula, *ὡς γέγραπται*; Egerton and Matthew have the word order of head-term-modifier with demonstrative following (*ὁ [λαὸς οὗ]|τος*), while Mark has the opposite order (*οὗτος ὁ λαὸς*); Egerton uses the intensive pronoun (*αὐτ[ῶν*), not used here in the Gospels; Egerton ll. 15–16 appears to have predicator-complement word order (*αὐτ[ῶν τιμῶσιν*), but Mark 7: 7 and Matt. 15: 8 have complement-predicator (*με τιμᾷ*), as well as a change in number according to this reconstruction; and Egerton l. 18 (note that the text is not certain), Mark 7: 7, and Matt. 15: 8 have differing word order around *ἐντάλ[ματα*. Egerton agrees with Matthew against Mark in several of the specific variants (e.g. deleting use of *ὑποκριτῶν*, the only use of this noun in Mark). In most instances, Egerton appears to have Alexandrian syntax as opposed to the Synoptics (e.g. headterm-modifier with the demonstrative following). Egerton is also closer to the Septuagint than the Gospels, for example, in its use of the intensive pronoun and possible use of the plural *τιμῶσιν*.

Egerton appears to use all of the Gospels, including both the Synoptics and John. This apocryphal text has one episode without direct New Testament citations or clear parallels. Even episode 3—if not indirectly from the New Testament—seems to be part of a Gospel-influenced text. In this episode, Egerton is like a number of other apocryphal gospels that, while clearly based upon the canonical Gospel accounts, do not draw directly upon any specific passages.

P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 (Fayyum Fragment)[17]

P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 (the Fayyum fragment), usually dated to the early third century (though it may be as early as the late second century), with a text that is marginally earlier, conflates two canonical Gospel passages, Mark 14: 26–7 and 29–30, and Matt. 26: 30–1 and 33–4. The episode records Jesus' conversation with Peter about his betrayal.

> P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 ll. 1–4: *ἐ]ξάγειν ὡς εἶπεν ὅτι ἅ[παντες | ἐν ταύτῃ] τῇ νυκτὶ σκανδαλισ[θήσεσ|θε κατὰ] τὸ γραφὲν πατάξω τὸν [ποιμέ|να καὶ τὰ] πρόβατα διασκορισθήσ[εται*; GNT: *καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε, ὅτι γέγραπται, Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται* (Mark 14: 26–7); *Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ Ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν. Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, γέγραπται γάρ, Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης* (Matt. 26: 30–1)

There is much reconstruction and uncertainty regarding these lines. P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 l. 1 uses *ἐ]ξάγειν*, a word that only appears in the Gospels in Mark 15: 20, rather than *ἐξῆλθον* found in both Matthew and Mark; P. Vindobonensis Greek 2325 l. 2 puts the prepositional phrase *ἐν ταύτῃ] τῇ νυκτὶ* before the verb *σκανδαλισ[θήσεσ|θε*, following Matthew's content but in different word order; P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 l. 3 uses the participial phrase *τὸ γραφὲν*, rather than the finite form found in both Matthew and Mark; P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 appears to quote Zechariah 13: 7 according to Mark's version at 14: 27, but with some variants; and P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 l. 4 uses the more grammatically regular third person singular verb with the neuter plural subject, rather than the third person plural, reconstructed according to line length, thus following the person of the Gospels though not the number. P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 appears to be a grammatically refined conflation of the two Gospel sources.

> P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 ll. 4–7: [... *εἰ|πόντος το]ῦ Πέτρου καὶ εἰ πάντες ο[ὐκ ἐγὼ λέ|γει Ἰησοῦς πρὶ]ν ἀλεκτρυὼν δὶς κοκ[κύσει τρὶς | σὺ σήμερόν με ἀ]παρνήσῃ*; GNT: *ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ, Εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ'*

[17] I use the edn. in S. E. Porter and W. J. Porter, *New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments: New Editions* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 290–4. Other important edns. (among many) include G. Bickell, 'Das Nichtkanonische Evangelien-Fragment', in *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, 1/3–4 (Vienna: K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1887), 53–61; K. Wessely, 'Le Fragment relatif au reniement de Saint Pierre appartenant a la collection de l'Archiduc Rainer', in K. Wessely, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, 4.2. *Les Plus Anciens Monuments du Christianisme écrits sur papyrus* (Paris: Firmin-Didot 1908), 173–7; T. J. Kraus, '*P.Vindob.G* 2325: Das sogenannte Fayûm-Evangelium—Neuedition und kritische Rückschlüsse', *ZAC/JAC* 5 (2001): 197–212; repr. and corrected in English tr. in Kraus, *Ad fontes* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 69–94. For information on P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 drawn on below, besides the above, see Kraus in Kraus *et al.*, *Gospel Fragments*, 219–27; T. J. Kraus, 'The Fayum Gospel', in Foster, ed., *Non-Canonical Gospels*, 150–6.

οὐκ ἐγώ. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ (Mark 14: 29–30); ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι. ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με (Matt. 26: 33–4)

There is much reconstruction and uncertainty regarding these lines as well. P. Vindobonensis Greek 2325 ll. 4–5 has the genitive construction for Peter speaking, rather than the finite construction as in both Gospels, with the genitive construction linking the two New Testament passages in the papyrus document; P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 l. 5 has *καὶ εἰ πάντες*, rather than *εἰ καὶ πάντες* in Mark or *εἰ πάντες* in Matthew, an apparent conflation; the reconstruction of P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 ll. 5–6 seems to require the Markan wording *λέ|γει Ἰησοῦς*; P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 l. 6 uses the word *ἀλεκτρυὼν*, not found in the New Testament; P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 ll. 6 and 7 follows Mark in the number of times the rooster crows and in the indication of it happening today, neither of which is specified in Matthew; and P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 l. 6 uses the word *κοκ[κύσει*, rather than *φωνῆσαι*, within a different grammatical construction.

P.Vindobonensis Greek 2325 appears to conflate the Matthean and Markan passages, adding later and more explicit elements.

P.Merton II 51[18]

This third-century gospel-like text relates how tax-gatherers and others acknowledged God's goodness and confessed their sins, while the Pharisees rejected God, with a brief portion on the verso speaking of producing good and bad fruit. This text alludes to Luke (Luke 7: 30 in recto ll. 4–7, Luke 7: 36 in recto l. 8, Luke 6: 45 in verso ll. 2–4, and Luke 6: 46 in verso ll. 6–7) and such books as 1 John and 2 Corinthians, as well as possibly the *Gospel of Thomas*. There is only one significant quotation from the canonical Gospels.

Recto ll. 1–2: *καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἀκούσαντες ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεὸν*; GNT: *καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν* (Luke 7: 29)

P.Merton II 51 appears to 'correct' the canonical Gospel text by shifting the aorist participle from referring just to the people hearing to including both the people and tax-collectors as hearing.

[18] I use the edn. by T. J. Kraus *et al.*, *Gospel Fragments*, 252–63. The *editio princeps* is B. R. Rees, 'Christian Fragment', in Rees *et al.*, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Wilfred Merton*, ii (Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1959), 1–4. For information on P.Merton II 51, besides above, see S. E. Porter, 'POxy II 210 as an Apocryphal Gospel and the Development of Egyptian Christianity', in I. Andorlini *et al.*, eds., *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze, 23–29 agosto 1998* (Florence: Istituto Papirologico 'G. Vitelli', 2001), 1095–1108, esp. 1105–6; Bernhard, *Other Early Christian Gospels*, 99.

P.Oxyrhynchus X 1224[19]

P.Oxyrhynchus X 1224 is a fragment of a late third- or early fourth-century gospel-like codex with three numbered pages. The fragmentary document makes it difficult to establish the exact nature of the text, and some have questioned whether this is a gospel. There are a number of apparent allusions to the Greek New Testament (e.g. frag. 2 verso col. 1 l. 3 has *διδα]χὴν καιν[ήν*, reminiscent of Mark 1: 27), but only one quotation.

> Frag. 2 recto col. 1 ll. 2–3: *ὁ γὰρ μὴ ὢν καθ᾽ ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν*; GNT: *ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐστιν* (Matt. 12: 30); *ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ᾽ ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν* (Mark 9: 40 and Luke 9: 50).

There is apparent conflation in P.Oxyrhynchus X 1224 of the participial construction in Matthew with the syntax and wording of Mark and Luke.

The Greek Gospel of Thomas Fragments[20]

Most scholars think that the Greek fragments and the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* are not directly related, and that the Greek fragments reflect a different edition of the original text. The Greek fragments have been dated to the late second or early third century for P.Oxyrhynchus I 1 and possibly the same for P.Oxyrhynchus IV 655 (though it may be later), with P.Oxyrhynchus IV 654 being in the third century. There are several passages in the Greek *Gospel of Thomas* fragments worth noting for their relationship to the Greek text of the New Testament.

> P.Oxyrhynchus 654, ll. 25–6: *πολλοὶ ἔσονται π[ρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ] | οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι*; GNT: *πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ [οἱ] ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι* (Mark 10: 31); *πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι* (Matt. 19: 30); *καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἳ ἔσονται πρῶτοι, καὶ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἳ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι* (Luke 13: 30).

P.Oxyrhynchus 654 is virtually identical (according to the reconstruction) with Mark and Matthew, with Luke significantly different.

[19] I use the edn. by Kraus in Kraus *et al.*, *Gospel Fragments*, 264–80. The *editio princeps* is P.Oxyrhynchus X 1224: B. P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri X* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1914), 1–10. For information on P.Oxyrhynchus X 1224, besides above, see Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 35.

[20] I use the *editio princeps* in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus collection for each of the fragmentary Greek *Gospel of Thomas* documents: B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri I* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898), 1–3; *IV* (1904), 1–22, 22–8; cf. *ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: Sayings of Our Lord* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1897). For information on the Greek *Gospel of Thomas* fragments, besides above, see R. Summers, *The Secret Sayings of the Living Jesus* (Waco, Tex.: Word, 1968); J. A. Fitzmyer, 'The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas', in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (n.pl.: Scholars Press, 1974), 355–433; Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 123–32; Bernhard, *Other Early Christian Gospels*, 16–19.

P.Oxyrhynchus 654, ll. 29–30: [*οὐ γάρ ἐσ*]|*τιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανε*[*ρὸν γενήσεται*; GNT: *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ* (Mark 4: 22); *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται* (Luke 8: 17).

P.Oxyrhynchus 654 agrees with Luke, against Mark. Luke and P.Oxyrhynchus 654 have syntax that has smoothed the awkward conjunction of clauses in Mark.

P.Oxyrhynchus 1, verso ll. 1–4: *καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις* | *ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος* | *τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου*; GNT: *τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου* (Matt. 7: 3 and Luke 6: 41).

The prefixed form of the verb is found in P.Oxyrhynchus 1 and Matt. 7: 5 and Luke 6: 42, indicating conflation. The use of the adverb and the infinitive in P.Oxyrhynchus 1 seems to have made syntactically explicit the sense of the two Gospels.

P.Oxyrhynchus 1, recto ll. 9–12: *οὐ*|*κ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐ*|*τ*[*ο*]*ῦ*; GNT: *οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ* (Mark 6: 4); *οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι* (Matt. 13: 57); *οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ* (Luke 4: 24).

P.Oxyrhynchus seems to be a more elegant conflation of the Synoptic texts.

P.Oxyrhynchus 655, ll. 3–7: *μήτε* [*τῇ* | [*τροφῇ ὑ*]*μῶν τί φά*|[*γητε μήτε*] *τῇ στ*[*ο*|[*λῇ ὑμῶν*] *τί ἐνδύ*|[*ση*]*σθε*; GNT: *μή μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε* (Matt. 6: 25); *μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε* (Luke 12: 22).

P.Oxyrhynchus 655 appears to be a rough paraphrase of the Gospels.

P.Oxyrhynchus 655, ll. 8–10: *τῶν* [*κρί*|*νων ἅτι*[. . .]*ὐξά*|*νει οὐδὲ ν*[*ήθ*]*ει* (I follow the diplomatic text of the *editio princeps*; however, there are two major reconstructions offered: *ἅτινα αὐξάνει οὐδὲ νήθει* or *ἅτινα οὐ ξαίνει οὐδὲ νήθει*);[21] GNT: *τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ πῶς αὐξάνουσιν, οὐ κοπιῶσιν οὐδὲ νήθουσιν* (Matt. 6: 28); *τὰ κρίνα πῶς αὐξάνει, οὐ κοπιᾷ οὐδὲ νήθει* (Luke 12: 27).

With such controversy over the reconstruction in P.Oxyrhynchus, it is difficult to use it for comparison with the Gospels. However, I believe that the first reconstruction is probably correct. If this is the case, Luke and P.Oxyrhynchus use the singular with the neuter plural subject, rather than the singular in Matthew.

There are also some conceptual parallels in P.Oxyrhynchus 655, ll. 13–15, with Matt. 6: 27 and Luke 12: 25, with closer word order to the Matthew passage. P.Oxyrhynchus 1, recto ll. 15–20, has some words in common with

[21] For discussion, see S. E. Porter, 'P. Oxy. 655 and James Robinson's Proposals for Q: Brief Points of Clarification', *JTS* 52/1 (2000): 84–92.

Matt. 5: 14 and P.Oxyrhynchus 1, recto ll. 20–2, has a phrase in common with Matt. 10: 27. There are textual resemblances between P.Oxyrhynchus 655, ll. 41–5, and Matt. 23: 13 and Luke 11: 52.

Although the evidence is not decisive, there are a number of instances where it appears that *Thomas* follows a text that is represented in Matthew and/or Luke, and appears to follow an improved or more regularized grammar that either corrects or conflates features of the canonical Gospel texts.

Protevangelium of James[22]

The *Protevangelium of James*—dated to between 150 and 250 (around the last part of the second century would be agreeable to most)—is an unhistorical expansion upon the infancy narratives found in the canonical Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Apparently never considered scriptural, and therefore questionable for consideration as an apocryphal document (despite its being considered valuable in various early ecclesial circles), the account in its earliest stages was apparently given to textual variation, as is evident even in some of the earliest manuscripts. The manuscript tradition for the *Protevangelium of James* is extensive, with there being around 140 Greek manuscripts in existence—not counting the manuscripts in the numerous ancient languages into which the *Protevangelium* was translated (apart from Latin, where the manuscript evidence is lacking). Most of these Greek manuscripts date to after the tenth century, although there are several manuscripts that are earlier, including a number of papyri.[23] Because of the clear utilization of the canonical Gospel infancy accounts and adding much speculative supplementary material to embellish the Gospels, there are numerous allusions to the Gospel accounts,[24] but actual quotations of the Greek New Testament in the *Protevangelium of James* are relatively few.

[22] I use the edn. by R. F. Hock, *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1995), based upon P.Bodmer V (M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer* V: *Nativité de Marie* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1958)) but according to the revised edn. of E. de Strycker, *La Forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961), which includes supplementation from other MSS. Other significant edns. include Constantin Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Leipzig: Avenarius & Mendelssohn, 1853), 1–49. For information on the *Protevangelium of James*, see Hock, *Infancy Gospels*, 2–30; Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 48–53; and P. Foster, 'The Protevangelium of James', in Foster, ed., *Non-Canonical Gospels*, 110–25.

[23] P. Bodmer V, 3rd or early 4th cent., but with signs of textual alteration; PSI 1.6, 4th or perhaps 5th cent.; P.Grenfell 1.8, 5th or 6th cent.; and P.Oxyrhynchus L 3524, 6th cent. See van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus litteraires juifs et chretiens*, nos. 599–602.

[24] See Hock, *Infancy Gospels*, 22.

Mary's Vision of the Angel

11.2 and GNT: *χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη· ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ* (Luke 1: 28)

11.2 and GNT: *εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν* (Luke 1: 42)

11.5: *μὴ φοβοῦ, Μαρία· εὗρες γὰρ χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πάντων δεσπότου*; GNT: *μὴ φοβοῦ, Μαριάμ, εὗρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* (Luke 1: 30)

11.7: *δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται, υἱὸς ὑψίστου*; GNT: *δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται, υἱὸς θεοῦ* (Luke 1: 35)

11.8 and GNT: *καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν* (Matt. 1: 21)

11.9: *εἶπεν δὲ Μαριάμ, ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ· γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα σου*; GNT: *καὶ εἶπε Μαρία, ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου· γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα σου* (Luke 1: 38)

Mary Visits Elizabeth

12.2: *καὶ εἶπεν· Μαρία, ἐμεγάλυνεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸ ὄνομά σου*; GNT: *καὶ εἶπεν Μαριάμ, μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον* (Luke 1: 46), with a slight grammatical change, including shift in tense-form

12.5: *πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου ἔλθῃ πρός ἐμέ*; GNT: *πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου πρός ἐμέ*; (Luke 1: 43–4), with rough paraphrastic equivalence following

Joseph Confronts Mary

13.8 and GNT: *ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω* (Luke 1: 34)

Joseph's Revelation

14.3: *παραδιδοὺς ἀθῷον αἷμα εἰς κρίμα θανάτου*; GNT: *παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθῷον* (Matt. 27: 4); *εἰς κρίμα θανάτου* (Luke 24: 20)

14.6 and GNT: *τέξεται δὲ υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν* (Matt. 1: 21)

Mary and Joseph Accused by Others

15.13 and GNT: *ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω* (Luke 1: 34)

Visit of the Magi

21.9–11: *καὶ ἐὰν εὕρητε ἀπαγγείλατέ μοι, ὅπως κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ ὃν εἶδον ἀστέωρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ προῆγεν αὐτοὺς ἕως εἰσῆλθον ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ, καὶ ἔστη ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ παιδίου. καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν οἱ μάγοι ἑστῶτα μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας, ἐξέβαλον ἀπὸ τῆς πήρας αὐτῶν δῶρα χρυσὸν καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν*; GNT: *ἐπὰν δὲ εὕρητε ἀπαγγείλατέ μοι, ὅπως κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀστὴρ ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ προῆγεν αὐτοὺς ἕως ἐλθὼν ἐστάθη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον. ἰδόντες δὲ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα. καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἶδον τὸ παιδίον μετὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν* (Matt. 2: 8–11), where the first verse is close, but the following verses have verbal similarities, but also paraphrase. *Protevangelium of James* 21.12 and Matt. 2: 12 have two significant words in common.

Killing of the Children

22.1 and GNT: *τότε Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν ἐνεπαίχθη ὑπὸ τῶν μάγων . . . ἀνεῖλεν πάντας* (Matt. 2: 16)

22.4: *καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔβαλεν ἐν φάτνῃ*; GNT: *καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν φάτνῃ* (Luke 2: 7)

Simeon

24.13–14: *οὗτος γὰρ ἦν ὁ χρηματισθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον ἕως ἂν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἴδῃ*; GNT: *καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν ἢ ἂν ἴδῃ τὸν Χριστὸν κυρίου* (Luke 2: 25–6)

The *Protevangelium of James* is clearly dependent upon the canonical account in at least three ways: (1) it copies the canonical text word for word, sometimes for relatively extensive lengths; (2) it extensively paraphrases the Greek New Testament, usually including a number of words from the canonical text; and (3) it draws upon the two canonical Gospel infancy accounts, and conflates them in its own ordering and sequence, thus displacing or altering the canonical contexts. The fluidity and flexibility with which the *Protevangelium of James* uses the Greek New Testament indicates that the texts of both canonical Gospel accounts were relatively well fixed in wording and order by the time of composition of the *Protevangelium of James*, as phrases regularly recur in the same order in the *Protevangelium of James* as in the Greek New Testament. Because the *Protevangelium of James* has felt free to

change wording, add scenes, events and details, and transpose contexts of the canonical account, it is difficult to use the text of *Protevangelium of James* to comment on the Greek New Testament.

CONCLUSION

There are several observations to make regarding the text of the Greek New Testament in the early apocryphal gospels. (1) The evidence for the Greek New Testament in the apocryphal gospels is not as great as one might expect. There are numerous works that cite the text of the New Testament very little, with some not quoting it at all. P.Egerton 2 and the *Gospel of Peter* appear to cite the Greek New Testament most frequently. (2) There are a number of sometimes competing factors to be evaluated when the texts of the apocryphal gospels and the canonical Gospels are compared, but the general tendency is for the apocryphal text to modify and/or improve the canonical source, and often to conflate several of the Gospel accounts. This conflation often combines elements of each of the accounts, although at other times the apocryphal text seems simply to follow one and then the other. The Synoptic Gospels are all used by the apocryphal authors, but John's Gospel appears to have been used right alongside the Synoptics in many instances. Sometimes John's Gospel appears on its own or in concentrated instances, but it is also integrated with the Synoptics. (3) At the conclusion of this study, we can see that the evidence from the apocryphal gospel literature is that the text of the Greek New Testament was relatively well established and fixed by the time of the second and third centuries. In those places where there are indications of transmissional changes, the vast majority of these changes indicate that the apocryphal literature has drawn upon the canonical texts. More than that, there are also numerous instances where not only the wording has been copied, but the structure of events and sequencing appears to be dependent upon the canonical accounts.

20

Irenaeus's Text of the Gospels in *Adversus haereses*

D. Jeffrey Bingham and Billy R. Todd, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

Scholars have long been interested in the textual traditions of Irenaeus of Lyons, the sources of his biblical references, and the question of the relationship between the Latin translation and his original Greek.[1] From the nineteenth century we have the studies of B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort as well as that of W. Sanday.[2] During the first quarter of the last century, H. F. von Soden (1911), W. Sanday, C. H. Turner, and A. Souter (1923), H. J. Vogels (1924), J. Chapman (1924), B. Kraft (1924), and A. Merk (1925) all offered the results of their investigations.[3] M. J. Lagrange (1935) and K. T. Schäfer (1951) made their own contributions as the twentieth century progressed.[4] In 1989, J. N. Birdsall and W. C. Price, building on earlier work, set forth their

[1] The following introduction draws from D. J. Bingham, *Irenaeus' Use of Matthew's Gospel in Adversus Haereses* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 7–10.

[2] B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek with Notes on Selected Readings* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988); W. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1876).

[3] H. F. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte* (4 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–13), ii. 1615–20; W. Sanday and C. H. Turner with assistance from A. Souter, eds., *Novum Testamentum Sancti Episcopi Lugdenensis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), hereafter cited as Sanday and Turner; H. J. Vogels, 'Der Evangelientext des hl. Irenaeus', *RB* 36 (1924): 21–33; J. Chapman, 'Did the Translator of St. Irenaeus Use a Latin N.T.?', *RB* 36 (1924): 34–51; B. Kraft, *Die Evangelienzitate des heiligen Irenäus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1924); A. Merk, 'Der Text des Neuen Testamentes beim hl. Irenaeus', *ZKT* 49 (1925): 302–15.

[4] M. J. Lagrange, *La Critique rationelle*, ii. *Critique textuelle,* 2nd edn. (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1935), 174–7; K. T. Schäfer, 'Die Zitate in der lateinischen, Irenäusübersetzung und ihr Wert für die Textgeschichte des Neuen Testaments', in N. Adler, ed., *Vom Wort des Lebens* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1951), 50–9.

conclusions.[5] Furthermore, 1996 brought the publication of the proceedings from the 1994 Lunel Colloquium on Codex Bezae. The papers of D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux would also be important.[6]

Westcott and Hort declared Irenaeus's text to be 'definitely Western'.[7] Von Soden, in keeping with his classifications, believed that Irenaeus 'had the I-H-K text before him'.[8] Souter narrowed the bishop's text to the I text, arguing that he had 'used an ancestor of the Greek side of *Codex Bezae*'.[9] In Souter's view, of course, Irenaeus's text would have been closer to the Old Latin's Greek original. Kraft, on the other hand, believed that Irenaeus's references should be seen as most closely related to two groups: (1) the H text of von Soden, of Egyptian origin, with B and א as its best witnesses; and (2) a group of variants within a Syro-Latin tradition.[10] The latter, he thought, was derived from a pre-Tatianic harmony which explained any readings like those in the Western text (D). Merk contextualized Irenaeus as a man within an age of harmonization, an environment with the likes of the harmonies of Justin and Tatian, but did not think Irenaeus's material derived from a harmony.[11]

Lagrange, too, would distance the bishop from a harmony.[12] *Contra* Kraft, he harmonized 'more boldly than D' and did not reference a harmony which would ultimately become a text like D. Instead, Irenaeus knew manuscripts like type B and type D, but independently went beyond the D type. Irenaeus harmonized 'without a harmony before his eyes'.[13]

Price offered the first study of Irenaeus's New Testament text since the publication of the Sources chrétiennes critical edition (SC).[14] His quantitative analysis of Matthew, Luke, and John (data from Mark's material provided too small a sample to yield meaningful measurements) led him to conclude that Irenaeus's references have 'the strongest affinity with the Western text-type'.[15] The results, in terms of percentages of agreement with each group were: Western, 63.9; Alexandrian, 53.6; Caesarean, 53.4; and Byzantine, 52.9.[16]

[5] J. N. Birdsall, 'The Western Text in the Second Century', in W. L. Petersen, ed., *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 3–17; W. C. Price, 'The Textual Relationships of Quotations from the Four Gospels in Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*' (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989).

[6] D. C. Parker, 'The Palaeographical Debate', in D. C. Parker and C. B. Amphoux, eds., *Codex Bezae* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 329–36; C. B. Amphoux, 'Le Texte', ibid. 337–54.

[7] Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 160.

[8] Von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ii. 1619.

[9] C. H. Turner, 'Preface', in Sanday and Turner, *Novum Testamentum Sancti Episcopi Lugdenensis*, p. xviii.

[10] Kraft, *Die Evangelienzitate des heiligen Irenäus*, 85–7, 107, 111.

[11] Merk, 'Der Text des Neuen Testaments beim hl. Irenaeus', 309–15.

[12] Lagrange, *La Critique rationelle*, ii.175–6.

[13] Ibid. 177.

[14] *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les heresies, Livres 1–5,* ed., tr., and annot. A. Rousseau et al. (Paris: Cerf, 1979 [Livre 1], 1982 [Livre 2], 1974, 2002 [Livre 3], 1965 [Livre 4], 1969 [Livre 5]).

[15] Price, 'Textual Relationships of Quotations', 40.

[16] Ibid. 183.

Birdsall's conclusions were twofold. First, that Irenaeus's use of the New Testament in *Adversus haeresus* indicates that distinctive Greek textual variants were known in the second century. And, second, that such variants were 'not infrequently those which survived in the witnesses of the so-called Western-Text'.[17] Finally, Parker argued that Irenaeus used a '*Vorlage* of D or a manuscript of a similar text-type'. Amphoux, likewise, argued for a text 'close to Codex Bezae'.[18]

Scholars have also been interested in the question of the Latin translation of *Adversus haereses* and its relation to Irenaeus's original Greek. Sanday observed Irenaeus's discipline in quoting the New Testament. He was not 'notorious for free quotation'.[19] Sanday, however, along with Westcott and Hort, and to a degree Souter, expressed concern that the Latin translator may have conformed the Greek of Irenaeus to a Latin version.[20] Von Soden was of a different opinion. He was confident in the translator's 'literal translation of the Greek original'.[21] Turner joined him in this confidence, as did Vogels.[22] Indeed, this is also the chief thesis of Chapman, who argued that the translator 'simply translated the Greek before him'.[23] This thesis would be presented again by Lagrange and Schäfer.[24] The latter argued that any influence from a Latin version was unintentional. The chances, then, of reconstructing Irenaeus's Greek Bible were believed to be quite good.

In this chapter we intend to retest the findings of this history of scholarship, particularly as it pertains to Irenaeus's use of Matthew, Luke, and John in *Adversus haereses*. Like Price, we will have the advantage of the SC critical edition. But this study, though recognizing the important contribution of Price, goes beyond his in significant ways.

THE APPARATUS

The apparatus for this study consists of a listing of variants for verses either cited or adapted by Irenaeus, organized by biblical verse.[25] The variants listed

[17] Birdsall, 'The Western Text in the Second Century', 13.

[18] Parker, 'The Palaeographical Debate', 333; Amphoux, 'Le Texte', 341.

[19] Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, 56.

[20] Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 160; Souter, 'The New Testament Text of Irenaeus', in Sanday and Turner, *Novem Testamentum Sancti Episcopi Lugdemensis*, p. cliv.

[21] Von Soden, *Die Scriften des Neuen Testaments*, ii. 1615.

[22] Turner, 'Preface', in Sanday and Turner, *Novum Testamentum Sancti Episcopi Lugdemensis*, p. xiii; Vogels, 'Der Evangelientext deshl. Irenaeus', 21–2, 32–3.

[23] Chapman, 'Translator of Irenaeus', 34.

[24] Lagrange, *La Critique rationelle*, ii. 175–6; Schäfer, 'Die Zitate', 59.

[25] Cf. G. D. Fee, 'The Text of John in the Jerusalem Bible: A Critique of the use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism', *JBL* 90 (1971): 169–70.

are from the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John. Mark is not represented due to the lack of available variants for the book.[26] For the layout of the apparatus, the biblical verse is first listed, followed by the location of the reference in the text of Irenaeus. The reader should refer to the SC critical edition of *Adversus haereses* for Irenaeus's full text. The text of *Adversus haereses* is noted in parentheses beginning with the book number of *Adversus haereses* followed by chapter, paragraph, and line number(s) of the SC edition. These line numbers refer to the line numbers of the Greek retroversion with the exception of book 2 where only the Latin text is available. The reader should, however, refer to the Latin text where both the Greek retroversion and the Latin are available as the Latin may differ from the Greek.[27] Following the Irenaeus reference is a notation [C] or [Ad], indicating whether the reference is a citation or adaptation. Each reference is then followed by one or more variants that occur within the verse. For each variant, the Greek is listed, followed by the witnesses that attest to the variant. Where a word occurs more than once in a verse, the repetition of the word is signified by a superscript. Each variant begins with the reading supported by Irenaeus followed by the alternate reading(s).

While it would be preferable for us to provide Irenaeus's version of a biblical verse in the apparatus, space considerations preclude us from presenting the text here.[28] Space limitations also necessitate limiting the number of variants listed in this apparatus. Therefore each Gospel represented in this study contains a selected apparatus of variants not specifically listed in Price.[29] While every verse reference included in the study is listed in the apparatus, only those variants that differ from the Price study are listed in detail. The remaining verse references not found in Price are listed in groupings along with those verses containing variants. The reader is referred to Price for those variants not detailed in this apparatus.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

The variants in Price's study were used as the basis for the variants in this apparatus. The data were checked for consistency against newer critical editions of the Greek text. To take advantage of advances in critical editions of the Greek New Testament, sources released since Price's work were

[26] Together, the critical edns. consulted only attest to 11 variants for Irenaeus in the book of Mark. It was determined that this was not enough data to make a thorough analysis.

[27] The apparatus in this study primarily refers to the Latin of Irenaeus (Iren^{lat}) except where the critical apparatus refers to the Greek (Iren^{gr}).

[28] Cf. G. D. Fee, 'The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria', *Bib* 52 (1971): 364.

[29] Price, 'Textual Relationships of Quotations'.

examined for additional variants.[30] By consulting the twenty-seventh edition of *Novum Testamentum Graece* (NA^{27}) and the fourth revised edition of the United Bible Society Greek New Testament (UBS^{4}), an additional sixty-five variants were added to the data for this study.[31] This includes thirty-six new variants in Matthew, twenty-four in Luke, and five in John. These additional variants were also compared to the apparatus developed by the Center for New Testament Textual Studies to further confirm how each manuscript attests to a particular variant.[32] With the addition of sixty-five variants, this apparatus contains 127 variants for Matthew, 148 variants for Luke, and 75 variants for John—a total of 350 variants.

Manuscripts for this study follow the manuscripts used by Price. These witnesses appear for each variant studied unless the biblical text is not attested in the manuscript. Manuscripts used for the study are as follows:

Matthew: $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ ℵ A B C D E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* 𝔐 *f*1 *f*13 28 33 565 700 892 1241 a b c d e k h Sc Ss

Luke: $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ ℵ A B C D E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* 𝔐 *f*1 *f*13 28 33 565 700 892 1241 a b c d e Sc Ss

John: $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ ℵ A B C D K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* 𝔐 *f*1 *f*13 28 33 565 700 892 1241 a b c d e Sc Ss

The manuscripts are divided into one of four text types for the Gospels as defined by Metzger: Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean, and Western.[33] For the purposes of this study, the text types are not further divided into subtypes, as was the case with Price. This was not necessary to determine the placement of Irenaeus's text within the given types. The manuscripts used in this study are categorized as follows:[34]

Alexandrian: $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ ℵ B C L W 33 892 1241

Byzantine: A E K W *Δ Π Ψ Ω* 𝔐

Caesarean: $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$*Θ* f1 f13 28 565 700

Western: ℵ D a b c d e Sc Ss

[30] Ibid. 26–7.

[31] Fee has noted the importance of critical edns. in the study of patristic text traditions. See G. D. Fee, 'Modern Textual Criticism and the Revival of the *Textus Receptus*', *JETS* 21 (1978): 26–7; K. Aland *et al.*, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece,* 27th edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993); K. Aland *et al.*, eds., *The Greek New Testament,* 4th rev. edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).

[32] Center for New Testament Textual Studies NT Critical Apparatus, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2007.

[33] B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament,* 2nd edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994), 15*; B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament,* 4th edn. (New York and Oxford: OUP, 2005), 52–106.

[34] Codex W is Alexandrian in Luke 1: 1–8: 12 and John. Codex W is Byzantine in Matthew and Luke 8: 13–24: 53. Codex ℵ is Western in John 1: 1–8: 38 and Alexandrian elsewhere.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

In order to obtain an accurate measurement of agreement between manuscripts, and to remain consistent with current scholarship, quantitative analysis is the preferred method of analyzing these variants. Quantitative analysis has become the preferred method of analysis for many text critics working in patristic texts, including Brooks, Ehrman, Eldridge, Fee, Oliver, and Price.[35] Each variant was entered into a worksheet and compared against individual manuscripts to determine the number of agreements and disagreements with these manuscripts. The agreements were compiled by text type and percentage of agreement was then determined for each manuscript and text type. Percentages were calculated for each of the three Gospels as well as for an overall percentage of agreement. For each Gospel, four charts of agreements are provided showing each manuscript's percentage of agreement within the proper text type. Finally, a chart is provided for each Gospel showing the overall percentages of agreement for the text types.

Since a majority of the Western texts in this study are Latin, a separate analysis was also performed by removing any variant that had no Greek witnesses attesting to the reading of Irenaeus. This was done to determine whether or not this majority of Syro-Latin manuscripts gave an advantage to the Western text.

MATTHEW SELECTED APPARATUS

Matt. 1: 11 (3.21.9.181–82) [Ad]

εγεννησεν τον ιωακειμ ιωακειμ δε εγεννησεν Iren$^{\text{lat vid}}$ *Θ* f^{1} 33

εγεννησεν ℵ B C E K L W *Δ Π Ω* f^{13} 28 565 700 892 1241 𝔐 a c h k

Matt. 1: 18 (3.11.8.211–12) (3.16.2.46–9) (3.21.4.85–8) [C]; Matt. 1: 20 (3.9.2.46) (3.16.2.51–3) (4.23.1.18–20) [C]; Matt. 1: 21 (3.16.2.53–4) (4.23.1.20–2) [C]

[35] J. A. Brooks, 'The Text of the Four Gospels as Quoted in the "Moralia" of Basil the Great' (Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 1961); B. D. Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986); L. A. Eldridge, *The Gospel Text of Epiphanius of Salamis*, (NTTS, SD 41; Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1969); G. D. Fee, 'Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships', *NTS* 15 (1968–9): 23–44; H. H. Oliver, 'The Text of the Pauline Epistles in the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria' (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1966); Price, 'Textual Relationships of Quotations', 33–4.

Matt. 1: 22 (3.21.4.90–1) [C]

δια ησαιου	Iren^{lat} D a b c h
δια	ℵ B C E K L W *Δ Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐

Matt. 2: 13 (3.9.2.46) [C]; Matt. 3: 16 (3.9.3.71–3) [C] (GF 9.3–5)

Matt. 3: 17 (3.9.3.73–4) [C] (GF 9.5–6)

συ ει	Iren^{lat} D a b
ουτος εστιν	ℵ B C E K (L) W *Δ Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐 c

Matt. 4: 10 (5.21.2.85–6) [C]; Matt. 5: 18 (1.3.2.32–3) [C] (GF 1.280–1) (4.34.2.30–2) [C]

Matt. 5: 22 (4.13.1.9–10) (4.16.5.112–13) [C]

ραχα	Iren^{lat} ℵ D W (f^{13} 565)
ρακα	B E K L *Δ Θ Π Ω* f^1 28 33 700 𝔐

Matt. 5: 23 (4.18.1.8–10) [C]; Matt. 5: 24 (4.18.1.10–12) [C]; Matt. 5:27 (4.13.1.5–6) [C]

Matt. 5: 28 (4.16.5.110–12) [C]

αυτην	Iren$^{lat\ vid}$ B D E K L W *Δ Θ Ω* f^{13} 28 33 565 700 𝔐 a b c h k
omit	ℵ *Π*
αυτης	f^1

Matt. 5: 33 (4.13.1.10–11) [C]; Matt. 5: 37 (4.13.1.12) [C]; Matt. 5: 40 (4.13.3.55–7) [C]; Matt. 5: 41 (4.13.3.60–1) [C]; Matt. 5: 44 (3.18.5.136–7) [C]; Matt. 5: 45 (2.22.1.32–3) (4.13.3.65–6) (4. 36.6.261–3) (5.27.1.29–31) [C]; Matt. 7: 2 (4.30.3.88–9) [C]

Matt. 7: 5 (4.30.3.114–16) [C]

την δοκον εκ του οφθαλμου σου	Iren$^{lat\ vid}$ E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐 a b c h k
εκ του οφθαλμου σου την δοκον	ℵ B C^{vid}

Matt. 8: 12 (4.36.8.323–34) [C]; Matt. 8: 13 (4.37.5.98–9) [C]

Matt. 9: 8 (5.17.2.31–2) [C]

omit	Iren^{lat}
εφοβηθησαν	ℵ B D W 33 892 f^1 a b c d h k
εθαυμασαν	C K L *Δ Θ Π Ω* f^{13} 565 700 𝔐
εθαυμαζαν	E

Matt. 10: 10 (4.8.3.76–7) [C]; Matt. 10: 26 (1.Pr.2.53–5) [C] (GF 1.53–4); Matt. 10: 29 (2.26.2.38–40) [C]

Matt. 10: 30 (2.26.2.26–7) [C]

αλλα	Iren$^{lat\ vid}$ D a b c e h k
υμων δε	ℵ B C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 565 700 𝔐

κεφαλης υμων	Iren$^{lat\ vid}$ D a b c e h k
κεφαλης	ℵ B C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 565 700 𝔐

Matt. 10: 35 (5.27.1.5–7) [C]

Matt. 11: 23 (4.36.3.123–7) [C]

ουρανου	Iren^{lat} ℵ B D W *Δ Θ* 28 a b c d (k)
του ουρανου	C E K L *Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 33 565 700 892 𝔐
υψωθηση	Iren^{lat} ℵ B C D W *Θ* f^1 𝔐 a b c d (k)
υψωθησει	L
υψωθης	E *Ω* f^{13} 700
υψωθεισα	K *Δ Π* h
υψωθησα	565
καταβηση	Iren^{lat} B D W a b c d h k
καταβιβασθηση	ℵ C E *Δ Θ Π Ω* f^1 33 700 892 𝔐
καταβιβασθησει	L f^{13} 565
καταβηβασθειση	28

Matt. 11: 24 (4.36.6.120–1) [C]; Matt. 11: 28 (1.20.2.35–6) [C] (GF 10.836)

Matt. 12: 18 (3.11.6.140–6) [C]

εν ω	Iren^{lat} C ^{vid} D f^1 33
εις ον	E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* f^{13} 28 565 700 𝔐
ον	ℵ B

Matt. 12: 20 (3.11.6.146–8) [C]; Matt. 12: 21 (3.11.6.148–9) [C]; Matt. 12: 36 (2.19.2.27–8) (4.16.5.109–11) [C]; Matt. 12: 40 (5.31.1.22–4) [C]; Matt. 13: 13 (4.29.1.6–7) [C]; Matt. 13: 16 (4.29.1.9–11) [C]; Matt. 13: 25 (4.40.3.41–3) [C] (GF 28.3–4)

Matt. 13: 30 (5.27.1.11) [Ad]

δεσμας	Iren$^{lat\ vid}$ D L *Δ* f^1 (33) 700 a b c
εις δεσμας	ℵ B C E K W *Θ Π Ω* f^{13} 28 565 𝔐 e h k

Matt. 13: 40 (4.40.2.30–2) [C] (GF 28.4); Matt. 13: 43 (2.23.1.34–5) (4.40.2.35–6) [C]; Matt. 13: 52 (4.9.1.3–5) (4.26.1.41–2) [C]; Matt. 15: 3 (4.9.3.99–100) (4.12.1.7–8) [C]

Matt. 15: 4 (4.9.3.98–101) [Ad]

ειπεν	Iren^{lat} B D *Θ* $f^1 f^{13}$ 700 892 a b c d e h
ενετειλατο λεγων	ℵ C E K L W *Δ Π Ω* 33 565 1241 𝔐

Matt. 15: 6 (4.9.3.101–2) [Ad]

τον λογον	Iren^{lat} B D *Θ* 700 892 a b d e h
τον νομον	ℵ C f^{13}
την εντολην	E K L W *Δ Π Ω* f^1 33 565 1241 𝔐 c

Matt. 16: 13 (3.18.4.74–5) [C]

τινα με	Iren^{lat} D E K L *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 565 892 1241 𝔐 (a b e)
τινα	א B C W 700 c
οι ανθρωποι λεγουσιν ειναι	Iren^{lat} D 700 (a b e)
λεγουσιν οι ανθρωποι ειναι	B E K L *Δ Θ Π Ω* f^{13} 28 33 565 892 1241 𝔐 c
λεγουσιν με οι ανθρωποι ειναι	C W
λεγουσιν ειναι οι ανθρωποι	f^1
οι ανθρωποι ειναι λεγουσιν	א

Matt. 16: 17 (3.18.4.77–8) [C]

Matt. 16: 21 (3.18.4.80–3) [Ad]

omit	Iren^{lat} 892
ο ιησους	C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 565 700 𝔐
ιησους	D
ιησους χριστος	א B
εις ιεροσολυμα απελθειν	(Iren^{lat}) א B D *Θ* $f^1 f^{13}$ 33 700 892 1241 e
απελθειν εις ιεροσολυμα	C E K L W *Δ Π Ω* 28 565 𝔐 a b c

Matt. 19: 7 (4.15.2.47–8) [Ad]

αυτην	(Iren^{lat}) B C E K W *Δ Π Ω* f^{13} 28 33 565 892 1241 𝔐
omit	א D L *Θ* f^1 700 a (b c) e h

Matt. 21: 16 (4.11.3.66–8) [C]; Matt. 21: 38 (4.36.1.15–17) [C]; Matt. 21: 41 (4.36.1.19–21) [C]; Matt. 21: 43 (4.36.1.24–6) [C]; Matt. 22: 4 (4.36.5.153–6) [C]; Matt. 22: 5 (4.36.5.156–8) [C]; Matt. 22: 6 (4.36.5.158–60) [C]; Matt. 22: 7 (4.36.5.160–2) (4.36.6.239–40) [C]; Matt. 22: 10 (4.36.5.165–7) [C]

Matt. 22: 12 (5.36.2.176–7) [C]

ηλθες	Iren^{lat} D b c e
εισηλθες	א B C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐 a h

Matt. 22: 13 (4.36.5.171–3) (4.36.6.212) [C]; Matt. 22: 31 (4.5.2.26–8) [C]

Matt. 23: 2 (4.12.4.56–7) [C]

καθεδρας μωυσεως	Iren^{lat} D *Θ* f^{13} a b c e h
μωυσεως καθεδρας	א B E K L W *Δ Π Ω* f^1 28 33 565 700 𝔐

Matt. 23: 3 (4.12.4.58–61) [C]; Matt. 23: 4 (4.12.4.61–2); Matt. 23: 24 (4.33.7.124–5) [C] (GF 16.7–8); Matt. 23: 26 (4.18.3.59–61) [C]; Matt. 23: 27 (4.18.3.48–52) [C]; Matt. 23: 34 (3.18.5.106–8) (4.9.1.13–14) [Ad]; Matt. 23: 37 (4.36.8.309–12) (4.37.1.1–2) (4.37.5.106–7) [C]

Matt. 24: 16 (5.25.2.36–42) [C]
εις τα Iren^{lat} B D *Δ Θ* f^{1} 28 33 700
επι τα ℵ E K L W *Π Ω* f^{13} 565 𝔐
in montibus a b c e h

Matt. 24: 17 (5.25.2.36–42) [C]
τι Iren^{lat} D *Θ* f^{1} 28 33 𝔐 a b c e h
τα B K L W *Δ Π Ω* f^{13} 565 700
το ℵ
τη E

Matt. 24: 21 (4.33.13.298–9) (5.29.1.18–19) [C] (GF 24.18–19); Matt. 24: 28 (4.14.1.40) [C]

Matt. 24: 35 (4.3.1.2–3) [Ad]
παρελευσεται Iren^{lat} B D L 33 e
παρελευσονται E K W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 565 700 𝔐 a b c h
omit ℵ

Matt. 24: 36 (2.28.6.148–50) [Ad]
ουδε ο υιος Iren^{lat} ℵ B D *Θ* f^{13} 28 a b c d (e) h
omit E K L W *Δ Π Ω* f^{1} 33 565 700 892 1241 𝔐

Matt. 24: 39 (4.36.3.102–7) [C]; Matt. 24: 42 (4.36.3.107–8) [C]

Matt. 24: 45 (4.26.5.112–16) [C]
κυριος Iren^{lat} ℵ B D L f^{1} 33 a e h
κυριος αυτου E K W *Δ Θ Π Ω* f^{13} 28 565 700 𝔐 b c

Matt. 24: 46 (4.26.5.112–16) [C]
ουτως ποιουντα Iren^{lat} ℵ B C D L *Θ* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 33 a b c e h
ποιουντα ουτως E K W *Δ Π Ω* 28 565 700 𝔐

Matt. 25: 21 (4.11.2.37–9) [C]
επει^{1}*επ* Iren^{lat} D a b c h
επι^{1} ℵ A B C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐

Matt. 25: 23 (4.27.2.107–8) [Ad]
επει^{1}*επ* Iren^{lat} D a b c h
επι^{1} ℵ A B C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐

πιστος ης Iren^{lat} B h
ης πιστος ℵ A C D E K W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐 a b c
εις πιστος L

Matt. 25: 41 (2.7.3.99–101) (2.32.1.36) (3.23.3.72–4) [C]

Matt. 26: 28 (4.17.5.144) (5.33.1.4–9) [Ad]

καινης διαθηκης	Iren^{lat} $\mathfrak{P}^{45\ vid}$ A C D E K W *Δ* *Π* *Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 565 700 1241 $\mathfrak{M}$ a (b) c d h
διαθηκης	ℵ B L *Θ* 33

Matt. 26: 29 (5.33.1.4–9) [C]

υμιν	Iren^{lat} $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ ℵ B *Θ* $f^1 f^{13}$ 33 a b c h
υμειν	D
υμιν οτι	A C E K L W *Δ* *Π* *Ω* 28 565 700 $\mathfrak{M}$
του	Iren^{lat} *Δ* 892
τουτου του	A B D E K W *Θ* *Π* *Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 $\mathfrak{M}$
τουτου	ℵ C L
πιω	Iren^{lat} D *Θ* 565
πινω	ℵ A C E K L W *Δ* *Π* *Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 700 $\mathfrak{M}$ a b c h
πεινω	B

Matt. 28: 19(3.17.1.14–16) [C]

MATTHEW ANALYSIS

The results of Tables 20.1–5 show Irenaeus's agreement with the Western text by a margin of 23.9 percent when compared with the text type having the second highest level of agreement. The high level of agreement with the Western text is due primarily to the strength of agreement with the Latin witnesses. Codex D, the only Greek Western manuscript represented here, is one of the weakest of the Western group, but still has an agreement of 65.2 percent, which is still high in relation to non-Western witnesses. The only

Table 20.1. Relationship of Irenaeus to Alexandrian Manuscripts in Matthew

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
892	51	51	102	50.0%
B	58	68	126	46.0%
33	55	65	120	45.8%
ℵ	55	70	125	44.0%
L	52	71	123	42.3%
C	37	53	90	41.1%
1241	34	52	86	39.5%

Table 20.2. Relationship of Irenaeus to Byzantine Manuscripts in Matthew

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
𝔐	48	73	121	39.7%
E	47	79	126	37.3%
W	47	79	126	37.3%
Δ	45	81	126	35.7%
K	44	80	124	35.5%
Ω	44	81	125	35.2%
Π	43	82	125	34.4%
A	3	7	10	30.0%

Table 20.3. Relationship of Irenaeus to Caesarean Manuscripts in Matthew

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
𝔓45	2	1	3	66.7%
f1	77	49	126	61.1%
Θ	58	57	115	50.4%
f13	53	73	126	42.1%
700	53	73	126	42.1%
28	46	72	118	39.0%
565	44	81	125	35.2%

Table 20.4. Relationship of Irenaeus to Western Manuscripts in Matthew

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
e	46	14	60	76.7%
k	42	14	56	75.0%
a	81	31	112	72.3%
c	84	34	118	71.2%
d	63	26	89	70.8%
b	82	35	117	70.1%
h	71	33	104	68.3%
Sc	19	10	29	65.5%
D	75	40	115	65.2%
Ss	19	12	31	61.3%

Table 20.5. Overall Agreement of Irenaeus to Manuscripts in Matthew

Western	70.0%
Caesarean	45.1%
Alexandrian	44.3%
Byzantine	36.4%

Table 20.6. Overall Agreement of Irenaeus to Manuscripts in Matthew with Non-Greek Variants Removed[a]

Western	72.0%
Caesarean	48.1%
Alexandrian	47.3%
Byzantine	38.8%

[a] Non-Greek variants defined here as a variant where no Greek witnesses agree with Irenaeus. The removal of these variants for analysis shows the influence of a text type represented primarily by Latin witnesses.

higher percentage of agreement with a non-Western witness is with 𝔓45 at 66.7 percent. However, it should be noted that there are only three readings for Matthew represented in 𝔓45. Table 20.6 shows the overall agreement of each type where agreements with Irenaeus are attested only by non-Greek manuscripts. The strength of Latin manuscripts in Matthew cannot be denied, but even if these non-Greek variants are removed from the equation, the Western text is still the strongest group of witnesses.[36]

LUKE SELECTED APPARATUS

Luke 1: 6 (3.10.1.4–6) [C]
εναντιον Iren lat vid ℵ B C *Ψ* 892 1241 b c e
ενωπιον A D E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐

Luke 1: 9 (3.10.1.7–10) [C]; Luke 1: 15 (3.10.1.19–20) [C]; Luke 1: 17 (3.10.1.21–3) (3.10.6.185–6) (3.11.4.94–5) [C]; Luke 1: 30 (3. 10.2.37–9) [C]; Luke 1: 32 (3.10.2.39–41) (3.16.3.111–13) [C]; Luke 1: 35 (3.21.4.89–91) [C]; Luke 1: 46 (3.10.2.48–9) (4.7.1.14–15) [C]

Luke 1: 47 (4.7.1.16–17) [C]
εν τω θεω Iren lat D a b c d Ss
επι τω θεω ℵ A B C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* $f^1 f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700

[36] The reduction in the high number of disagreements present in the non-Greek variants causes a rise in the percentage of agreement in the remaining variants. This holds true for the apparatus of Luke and the apparatus of John as well as the overall conclusions.

Luke 1: 55 (3.10.2.52–3) [C]; Luke 1: 68 (3.10.3.70–1) [C]; Luke 1: 69 (3.10.3.72–3) [C] (3.10.4.106–7) [Ad]

Luke 1: 70 (3.10.3.75–6) [C]

αγιων προφητων αυτου των απ αιωνος	Iren^{lat} D a c d
των αγιων απ αιωνος προφητων αυτου	B L *Δ* f^{13} 33 b e
των αγιων απ αιωνος αυτου προφητων	א W
των αγιων των απ αιωνος προφτηων αυτου	A C K *Θ Π Ψ Ω* f^{1} 28 565 700 𝔐

Luke 1: 71 (3.10.3.74–5) [C]; Luke 1: 72 (3.10.3.75–7) [C]; Luke 1: 74 (3.10.3.78–9) [C]; Luke 1: 75 (3.10.3.79–80) [C]; Luke 1: 76 (3.10.3.81–3) [C]; Luke 1: 77 (3.10.3.83–4) [C]; Luke 1: 78 (3.10.2.59) [C]; Luke 1: 79 (3.10.2.59–61) [C]; Luke 2: 11 (3.10.4.117–18) [C]; Luke 2: 13 (3.10.4.108–9) [C]; Luke 2: 14 (3.10.4.109–10) (3.10.4.143–4) [C]; Luke 2: 20 (3.10.4.148–51) [C]

Luke 2: 22 (3.10.5.157–9) [C]

αυτου	Iren^{lat} D a b c d e
αυτων	א A B E K L W *Δ Π Ψ Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐
αυτον	*Θ*

Luke 2: 23 (1.3.4.54–5) [C] (GF 1.303–4) (3.10.5.159–61) [C]; Luke 2: 24 (3.10.5.161–3) [C]; Luke 2: 29 (1.8.4.109–11) [C] (GF 1.885–8) (3.10.5.165–6) (3.16.4.122–3) (4.7.1.9–10) [C]; Luke 2: 32 (3.10.5.168–9) (4.7.1.12–13) [C]; Luke 2: 38 (3.10.5.169–72) [C]; Luke 2: 49 (1.20.2.16–17) [C] (GF 10.816–17)

Luke 3: 5 (3.9.1.33) [Ad]

ευθειαν	Iren^{lat} א A C K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐
ευθειας	B D 892 a b c e

Luke 3: 17 (4.4.3.51–3) [C]

διακαθαραι	Iren^{lat} א B a b c e
διακαθαριει	A C D E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐
omit	Iren^{lat} D e d
αυτου^{3}	א A B C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 33 565 700 𝔐 a b c

Luke 4: 18 (4.23.1.36–9) [C]

με ιασασθαι τους συνετεριμμενους την καρδιαν	Iren^{lat} A E K *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* f^{1} 28 33 565 1241 𝔐
με	א B D L W f^{13} 700 892 a b c e Ss

Luke 4: 21 (4.23.1.40–1) [C]; Luke 5:31 (3.5.2.49–50) [C]

Luke 6: 4 (4.8.3.55–8) [C]

omit	Iren^{lat} ℵ D K W *Π* 565 700 1241 f^1f^{13}
λαβων	B C L *Θ* 892
ελαβεν και	A E *Δ Ψ Ω* 𝔐
εφαγεν και	28
εδωκεν	Iren^{lat} B L W *Ψ* f^1 a b c e
εδωκεν και	ℵ A D E K *Δ Θ Π Ω* f^{13} 28 33 565 892 (1241) 𝔐
omit	700

Luke 6: 25 (3.14.3.87–9) [C]; Luke 6: 26 (3.14.3.89–91) [C]

Luke 6: 31 (4.13.3.56–7) [C]

ανθρωποι	Iren^{lat} $𝔓^{75vid}$ B 700 1241 a b e
ανθρωποι και υμεις	ℵ A D E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* f^1f^{13} 28 33 𝔐 c
ανθρωποι υμεις	565
omit	Iren^{lat} D a e Ss
ομοιως	$𝔓^{45vid}$ $𝔓^{75vid}$ ℵ A B E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* f^1f^{13} 28 33 565 700 𝔐 a b c e
Luke 6: 40	(5.31.2.51–2) [C]
διδασκαλον	Iren^{lat} $𝔓^{75}$ ℵ B D L W *Θ* f^1f^{13} 33 700 892 a b c e
διδασκαλον αυτου	A C E K *Δ Π Ψ Ω* 28 565 𝔐

Luke 6: 46 (4.37.3.59–60) [C]; Luke 7: 35 (1.8.4.123) [C] (GF 1.900–1)

Luke 8: 51 (2.24.4.129–30) [C]

εισελθειν ουδενα	Iren^{lat} A C^c K W *Δ Π Ψ Ω* f^1 28 (565) 700 𝔐 Sc Ss
εισελθειν τινα συν αυτω	B C^* L *Θ* 33 1241
τινα συνελθειν αυτω	f^{13}
εισελθειν συν αυτω τινα	D a b c e
συνεισελθειν αυτω	ℵ
ιακωβον	Iren^{lat}
ιωαννην και ιακωβον	$𝔓^{75vid}$ B C D E K W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* f^1f^{13} 28 565 a b c e
ιακωβον και ιωαννην	ℵ A L 33 157 700 892 1241 𝔐

Luke 9: 60 (1.8.3.73–4) [C] (GF 1.846–7); Luke 9: 62 (1.8.3.67–8) [C] (GF 1.839–41)

Luke 10: 1 (2.21.1.14–16) [Ad]

omit	Iren^{lat} ℵ A C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* f^1f^{13} 28 565 700 892 1241 𝔐
δυο^1	$𝔓^{75}$ B D a b c d e Sc Ss

Luke 10: 17 (2.21.1.15–16) [C]; Luke 10: 19 (2.20.3.54–5) (5.24.4.80–1) [C]

Luke 12: 20 (3.14.3.109–10) [C]

απαιτουσιν	(Iren^{lat}) ℵ A D E K W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* f^1f^{13} 28 565 700 𝔐
αιτουσιν	$𝔓^{75}$ B L 33

Luke 12: 35 (4.36.3.97–8) (4.37.3.53–4) [C]; Luke 12: 36 (4.36.3.98–9) (4.37.3.54–7) [C]; Luke 12: 37 (4.37.3.57–8) (5.34.2.43–5) [C]; Luke 12: 38 (5.34.2.45–8) [C]

Luke 12: 43 (4.26.5.115–16) (4.37.3.57–8) [C]

ουτως ποιουντα	Iren^{lat} 𝔓^{45} 𝔓^{75} א *Ψ* f^{13} 33 b c e
ποιουντα ουτως	A B D E K W Y *Δ Θ Π Ω* f^{1} 28 565 700 𝔐
ουτω ποιουντα	L

Luke 12: 47 (4.37.3.58–9) [C]; Luke 12: 50 (1.21.2.24) [C] (GF 10.877–88); Luke 12: 58 (1.25.4.63–5) [C]; Luke 13: 7 (4.36.8.302–3) [C]; Luke 13: 15 (4.8.2.22–4) [C]; Luke 13: 16 (2.23.2.29–31) (4.8.2.24–7) [C]; Luke 13: 28 (4.8.1.9–11) [C]

Luke 13: 35 (4.36.8.319) [C]

υμων ερημος	Iren^{lat} D E *Δ Θ Ψ* f^{13} 28 33 700 892 1241 e
υμων	𝔓^{45vid} 𝔓^{75} א A B K L W *Π Ω* f^{1} 565 a b c d Ss

Luke 14: 12 (5.33.2.22–5) [C]; Luke 14: 14 (5.33.2.25–7) [C]; Luke 16: 9 (4.30.1.11–12) (4.30.3.105–7) [C]

Luke 16: 12 (2.34.3.61–2) [C]

δωσει υμιν	Iren^{lat} א D L *Θ Ψ* 33 892
υμιν δωσει	𝔓^{75} A B E K W *Δ Π Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 565 700 𝔐 a c e
omit	b

Luke 16: 16 (4.4.2.28–9) [C]; Luke 16: 19 (4.2.4.41–3) [C]; Luke 16: 31 (4.2.3.35–7) [C]; Luke 17: 28 (4.36.3.103–5) [C]; Luke 17: 29 (4.36.3.105–6) [C]

Luke 17: 30 (4.36.3.112–13) [C]

ουτως	Iren^{lat} 1241
κατα τα αυτα	B D K *Π Ψ* 892 b c e
κατα ταυτα	𝔓^{75vid} א A E L W *Δ Θ Ω* $f^{1}f^{13}$ 28 565 700 𝔐
omit	a

Luke 18: 7 (4.27.4.190–1) [C]; Luke 18: 8 (4.33.11.196–7) (4.27.4.192–3) [C]

Luke 18: 27 (2.10.4.56–7) (5.5.2.47–8) [C]

εστιν παρα τω θεω	Iren^{lat} A (E) K *Δ Θ Π* f^{13} 565^{su} P 700 𝔐 b c
παρα τω θεω εστιν	א B L *Ψ* f^{1} 28, 893, 1241
παρα θεω εστιν	D W a e
εστιν παρα θεω	*Ω*

Luke 19: 5 (1.8.3.75–6) [C] (GF 1.849–50)

Luke 19: 8 (4.12.5.110–12) [C]

διδωμι τοις πτωχοις	Iren^{lat} A E K W *Δ Π Ω* f^{13} 28 565 700 𝔐
τοις πτωχοις διδωμι	א D L *Θ Ψ* f^{1} 33 892 a b c d e
πτωχοις διδωμι	B

Luke 19: 42 (1.20.2.32–4) [C] (GF 10.833–4); Luke 20: 38 (4.5.2.29–30) [C]

Luke 21: 34 (4.36.3.92–5) (4.37.3.52–3) [C]
αι καρδιαι υμων Iren^{lat} A B W f^{13}
υμων αι καρδιαι ℵ C D E K L *Δ Θ Π Ψ* f^{1} 33 565 700 𝔐 a b c e
αι καρδιαι *Ω*

Luke 21: 35 (4.36.3.95–7) [C]; Luke 23: 34 (3.18.5.132) [C]; Luke 24: 25 (3.16.5.155–6) [C]; Luke 24: 39 (5.2.3.46–7) [C] (GF 4.18); Luke 24: 44 (3.16.5.158–60) [C]; Luke 24: 46 (3.16.5.162–3) (4.26.1.38–9) [C]; Luke 24: 47 (3.16.5.163–4) (4.26.1.39–40) [C]

LUKE ANALYSIS

The results of Tables 20.7–11 show Irenaeus's agreement with the Western text by a margin of only 3.2 percent when compared with the text type having the second highest level of agreement. The Latin manuscripts play a large role

Table 20.7. Relationship of Irenaeus to Alexandrian Manuscripts in Luke

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
ℵ	85	60	145	58.6%
C	31	26	57	54.4%
33	65	55	120	54.2%
W	35	30	65	53.9%
892	72	62	134	53.7%
1241	72	62	134	53.7%
L	73	70	143	51.1%
B	74	73	147	50.3%
𝔓75	28	32	60	46.7%

Table 20.8. Relationship of Irenaeus to Byzantine Manuscripts in Luke

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
𝔐	83	62	145	57.2%
Π	83	63	146	56.9%
Δ	81	62	143	56.6%
A	80	67	147	54.4%
K	77	65	142	54.2%
E	77	66	143	53.9%
W	43	39	82	52.4%
Ψ	77	70	147	52.4%
Ω	75	70	145	51.7%

Table 20.9. Relationship of Irenaeus to Caesarean Manuscripts in Luke

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
f1	96	51	147	65.3%
28	80	61	141	56.7%
f13	81	66	147	55.1%
565	78	65	143	54.6%
700	77	69	146	52.7%
Θ	73	69	142	51.4%
𝔓45	7	9	16	43.8%

Table 20.10. Relationship of Irenaeus to Western Manuscripts in Luke

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
c	91	49	140	65.0%
a	79	43	122	64.8%
d	77	42	119	64.7%
b	84	52	136	61.8%
e	82	54	136	60.3%
D	78	69	147	53.1%
Ss	14	31	45	31.1%
Sc	7	16	23	30.4%

Table 20.11. Overall Agreement of Irenaeus to Manuscripts in Luke

Western	59.0%
Caesarean	55.8%
Byzantine	54.5%
Alexandrian	53.2%

Table 20.12. Overall Agreement of Irenaeus to Manuscripts in Luke with Non-Greek Variants Removed

Caesarean	61.7%
Byzantine	60.4%
Western	60.3%
Alexandrian	59.1%

in the strength of the Western text in Luke. Irenaeus's strongest agreement in Luke other than with the Latin manuscript c is with the Caesarean Family 1 witness, followed closely by the other Latin manuscripts. Codex D is relatively weak in Luke, with a majority of other manuscripts having a higher agreement. As is seen in Table 20.12, this has an effect when non-Greek variants are removed. In Luke, a removal of non-Greek variants causes the Caesarean group to have the strongest agreement with the text used by Irenaeus. The relative weakness of Codex D in Luke combined with the strength of Family 1 helps the Caesarean group to become the strongest by a 1.3 percent margin when the non-Greek variants are removed. This indicates that the Latin witnesses are carrying the load in favour of a higher Western margin of agreement.

JOHN SELECTED APPARATUS

John 1: 3 (1.8.5.152) [C] (GF 1.932–3) (1.22.1.6–7) (2.2.5.72–3) (3.8.3.53–4) (3.11.1.27) (3.11.8.202) (4.32.1.20–1) (5.18.2.46–7) (3.21.10.224–5) [C]; John 1: 4 (1.8.5.160) [C] (GF 1.940–1) (3.11.1.28) [C] John 1: 5 (3.11.1.29–30) [C]; John 1: 6 (3.11.4.86–7) [C]; John 1: 12 (5.18.2.50–2) (5.18.3.78–9) [C]; John 1: 13 (3.16.2.69–70) (3.19.2.32–3) (5.1.3.86) [C]; John 1: 15 (3.10.3.87–8) [C]; John 1: 16 (3.10.3.88–9) [C]; John 1: 18 (1.8.5.133) [C] (GF 1.914) (3.11.6.132–4) (4.20.6.163–4) (4.20.11.278–9) [C]; John 1:29 (3.10.3.86–7) [C]

John 1: 49 (3.11.6.137–8) [C]

ει ο βασιλευς	Iren^{lat} 𝔓^{66} ℵ E K *Δ Θ Π Ω f*^{13} 28 565 700 𝔐 a b c e
βασιλευς ει	𝔓^{75} A B L W^{sup} *Ψ f*^{1} 33

John 1: 50 (4.9.2.46) [C]; John 2: 4 (3.16.7.231–2) [C]; John 2: 23 (2.22.3.66–7) [C]; John 3: 18 (5.27.2.51–2) [Ad] (5.27.2.53–5) [C]; John 3: 20 (5.27.2.58–9) [C]; John 3: 21 (5.27.2.59–61) [C]; John 3: 36 (4.37.5.101–3) [C]; John 4: 36 (4.23.1.3–5) (4.25.3.53–4) [C]; John 4: 38 (4.23.1.7–9) [C]; John 4: 41 (4.2.7.101–2) [C]; John 4: 42 (4.2.7.102–5) [C]; John 5: 28 (5.13.1.25–6) [C]

John 5: 29 (5.13.1.26–8) [C]

και οι δε	Iren^{lat} 𝔓^{66} W
οι δε	𝔓^{75} ℵ A D E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f*^{1}*f*^{13} 28 33 565 700 𝔐 b c
οι	B a e

John 5: 39 (4.10.1.1–4) [C]; John 5: 40 (4.10.1.4–5) [C]; John 5: 43 (5.25.4.77–9) [C]; John 5: 46 (4.2.3.27–8) (4.10.1.8–9) [C]; John 5: 47 (4.2.3.28–9) [C]; John 7: 30 (3.16.7.234–5) [C]; John 8: 36 (3.19.1.5–6) [C]; John 8: 56 (2.22.6.151–3) (4.5.3.53–5) (4.7.1.22–3) [C]; John 8: 57 (2.22.6.153–4) [C]; John 8: 58 (4.13.4.106) [C]

John 9: 6 (5.15.2.69–71) [Ad]

επεχρισεν	Iren^{lat} 𝔓^{66} ℵ C K L *Δ Θ Π Ψ f*^{1}*f*^{13} 28 33 565 700 𝔐 a b c e
επεχρεισεν	𝔓^{75} A D E *Ω*
επεθηκεν	B

John 11: 25 (4.5.2.48–9) [C]; John 11: 44 (5.13.1.12–13) (5.13.1.15) [C]; John 12: 24 (5.2.3.52–3) [C] (GF 4.53–4)

John 12: 32 (3.16.6.221) (4.2.7.116–17) [Ad]

παντα	Iren^{lat} 𝔓^{66} ℵ D a b c e
παντας	𝔓$^{75\ vid}$ A B E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f*^{1}*f*^{13} 28 33 565 700 892 1241 𝔐

John 14: 7 (3.13.2.25) (4.7.3.51–2) [C]; John 14: 9 (3.13.2.22–4) [C]; John 14: 28 (2.28.8.233–4) [C]; John 15: 15 (5.13.4.90–3) [C]

John 17: 5 (4.14.1.6–7) [C]

παρα σοι προ του γενεσθαι τον κοσμον	Iren^{lat} D
προ του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα σοι	ℵ A B C E K L W *Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f*^{1}*f*^{13} 28 33 565 700 𝔐 b c e
παρα σοι προ του τον κοσμον ειναι	𝔓^{66} a

John 17: 24 (4.14.1.31–2) [C]; John 19: 11 (4.18.2.72–3) [C]; John 20: 17 (5.31.1.29–31) [C]; John 20: 31 (3.16.5.173–5) [C]

JOHN ANALYSIS

The results of tables 20.13–17 show Irenaeus's agreement with the Western text by a margin of 5.8 percent when compared with the text type having the second highest level of agreement. Once again, the level of agreement with the Western text is due to the strength of agreement with the Latin witnesses.

Table 20.13. Relationship of Irenaeus to Alexandrian Manuscripts in John

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
892	38	21	59	64.4%
ℵ	28	19	47	59.6%
W	22	15	37	59.5%
C	29	20	49	59.2%
𝔓75	35	25	60	58.3%
𝔓66	41	31	72	56.9%
1241	40	31	71	56.3%
33	40	34	74	54.1%
B	40	35	75	53.3%
L	37	38	75	49.3%

Table 20.14. Relationship of Irenaeus to Byzantine Manuscripts in John

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
𝔐	47	28	75	62.7%
Δ	45	30	75	60.0%
K	44	31	75	58.7%
Π	44	31	75	58.7%
Ψ	43	32	75	57.3%
Ω	38	29	67	56.7%
A	38	32	70	54.3%
E	3	4	7	42.9%

Table 20.15. Relationship of Irenaeus to Caesarean Manuscripts in John

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
f1	49	26	75	65.3%
28	44	26	70	62.9%
700	47	28	75	62.7%
565	41	32	73	56.2%
f13	42	33	75	56.0%
Θ	40	35	75	53.3%
𝔓45	0	4	4	0.0%

Table 20.16. Relationship of Irenaeus to Western Manuscripts in John

MSS	Agree	Disagree	Total	Agree
b	52	21	73	71.2%
c	52	22	74	70.3%
a	49	24	73	67.1%
Sc	8	4	12	66.7%
e	49	25	74	66.2%
א	18	10	28	64.3%
d	34	21	55	61.8%
D	33	31	64	51.6%
Ss	4	6	10	40.0%

Table 20.17. Overall Agreement of Irenaeus to Manuscripts in John

Western	64.6%
Caesarean	58.8%
Byzantine	58.2%
Alexandrian	56.5%

Table 20.18. Overall Agreement of Irenaeus to Manuscripts in John with Non-Greek Variants Removed

Western	65.2%
Caesarean	61.5%
Byzantine	60.5%
Alexandrian	59.1%

Codex D is one of the weaker manuscripts with an agreement of 51.6 percent. Only manuscripts L, E, 𝔓45, and Ss have a lower level of agreement with Irenaeus. The strongest Greek witness is the Caesarean Family 1. According to Table 20.18, when non-Greek variants are removed from the equation, the Western text is still the strongest group by a small margin. Although the Western text still has the highest agreement, the Caesarean text once again shows strength of agreement when non-Greek witnesses are removed, as the difference in agreement between these two groups is reduced to 3.7 percent.

CONCLUSION

The results of Table 20.19 shows Irenaeus's overall agreement with the Western text of the Gospels at 64.4 percent. The Western text comes in front of the Caesarean by a margin of 11.8 percent. This is due to the considerable strength of the Western text in Matthew and the fact that Luke and John also showed primary agreement with the Western group. The removal of non-Greek witnesses causes all of the overall percentages to rise. Agreement with the Western text rises 1.5 to 65.9 percent agreement. The

Table 20.19. Overall Agreement of Irenaeus

Western	64.4%
Caesarean	52.6%
Alexandrian	50.5%
Byzantine	49.8%

Table 20.20. Overall Agreement of Irenaeus with Non-Greek Variants Removed

Western	65.9%
Caesarean	56.7%
Alexandrian	54.5%
Byzantine	53.8%

three other text types show a more considerable increase in percentage of agreement with the Caesarean increasing by 4.1 percent and the Alexandrian and Byzantine groups each increasing by 4.0 percent each. However, even with these increases in the percentage of agreement, the Western text still has the highest level of agreement with the text of Irenaeus.

This chapter, while building off of Price's work, is intended to improve on Price in several ways. The most current available critical editions of the Greek text were consulted in order to provide a broader range of variants. This had the result of providing a more complete set of data for the analysis by adding fifty-nine variants to the data pool. This chapter also addresses the fact that the Western text type is primarily attested by Latin manuscripts. It was necessary to add this to the analysis in order to show the effect of a primarily Latin text type on the quantitative analysis. Finally, the classification of some manuscripts was re-examined. Price did not place Codex *Δ* into a text type for analysis. This resulted in the manuscript not being included in the calculations in that analysis. In this study, Codex *Δ* was placed into the Byzantine text type.[37] Likewise, Price classified Codex ℵ as Alexandrian but ℵ is considered a strong Western witness in John 1: 1–8: 38.[38] This chapter divides Codex ℵ into the proper text types for analysis.

The results of this analysis show Irenaeus's agreement with the Western text of the Gospels. These results are in line with the results of Price, and the previous studies of Sanday and Turner, and Westcott and Hort among others discussed in the introduction.[39] The quantitative analysis of our 350 variants derived from Price's study, with updates from current critical editions, confirm the place of the Western text type as prominent in the text of Irenaeus. The strength of the primarily Latin Western text type suggests the possibility that the translator of *Adversus haereses* appealed to Latin translations of the Gospel text. This challenges the opinions of von Soden, Turner, Vogels, Chapman, Lagrange, and Schäfer, but sides with concerns expressed by Sanday, Westcott and Hort, and Souter. This chapter also suggests that perhaps the Gospel text that Irenaeus used was closer to manuscripts from which the Latin manuscripts were derived. This may challenge the conclusions of those like Parker and Amphoux who wish to see Irenaeus using a text closer to Codex Bezae. It may be that the text he used was closest to those behind the old Latin manuscripts. Furthermore, Codex B does not appear to be as strong a witness as Kraft may have supposed. On the other hand, it seems wise to echo Souter that Irenaeus's text was closer to the old Latin's Greek original and to join with Kraft in recognizing the strength of the Syro-Latin tradition.

[37] Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 82–3.

[38] Fee, 'Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John', 23–44.

[39] Price, 'Textual Relationships of Quotations', 186; Souter, 'The New Testament Text of Irenaeus', in Sanday and Turner, *Novum Testamentum Sancti Episcopi Lugdenensis*, pp. cxxxix, clv; Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 159–60.

21

Clement of Alexandria's Gospel Citations

Carl P. Cosaert

It has long been recognized that the citations of the Greek fathers offer a promising means to solving one of the most elusive goals of New Testament textual criticism—reconstructing a full and convincing account of the transmission history of the Greek New Testament.[1] In the same way that a geologist can gain a better sense of an area of earth by taking a core sample, analysis of patristic citations offers the possibility of obtaining a glimpse of what the New Testament looked like in a particular time and place in history. Most manuscripts and versions are simply unable to provide this level of specificity. It is only within the last few decades, however, that major methodological advances have made access to the patristic evidence more reliable and accessible than ever before.

The methodological breakthrough in patristic citations came in 1986 with the publication of Bart Ehrman's work, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*.[2] Since that time a slow, but ever steady, number of published and unpublished dissertations have employed Ehrman's methodology with minor improvements along the way. Several of these works are available in the Society of Biblical Literature's monograph series The New Testament in the Greek Fathers.[3] This ongoing research has resulted in an invaluable

[1] e.g. G. D. Fee, 'The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); B. D. Ehrman, 'The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence in New Testament Textual Criticism', in B. Aland and J. Delobel, eds., *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Church History* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994); 'The Use of the Church Fathers in New Testament Textual Criticism', in S. McKendrick and O. O'Sullivan, eds., *The Bible as Book* (London: British Library, 2003).

[2] Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels,* ed. G. D. Fee (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986).

[3] Two of the more recent volumes in the NTGF series include, C. D. Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis* (Atlanta: SBL, 2004); J.-F. Racine, *The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 2004).

amount of patristic evidence about the form of the New Testament text from various locations around the Mediterranean, and in particular from the famed city of Alexandria in Egypt. The examination of Alexandrian fathers like Origen,[4] Athanasius,[5] Didymus,[6] and Cyril,[7] for example, has largely testified to the existence and dominance of the so-called Alexandrian text type in the Gospels during the third and fourth centuries in Alexandria. Until recently, however, one of the most important and earliest pieces of patristic evidence from Alexandria was missing—the re-evaluation of Clement, the earliest Alexandrian father, on the basis of the latest methodological advances.

Clement's Gospel citations are of particular import because they provide one of the earliest patristic windows available on the form of the New Testament text—a time roughly a hundred or so years removed from the 'original' autographs. If properly evaluated, the nature of Clement's textual affinities offers the answer to several intriguing questions about the nature and transmission of the New Testament in Alexandria. How reliable, for example, were Clement's citations of the New Testament? What was the dominant textual influence in Alexandria during the earliest years of Christianity? Do Clement's textual affinities share any relationship to those of the later Alexandrian fathers? Unfortunately, previous textual studies of Clement's text produced conflicting reports and were beset with significant shortcomings and mistakes that rendered their conclusions unreliable.[8]

In light of the significance of Clement's text and the problems associated with previous examinations of his text, a fresh collation and thorough evaluation of Clement's citation habits and text of the Gospels was undertaken. While the full analysis and conclusions of that study were recently published as the ninth volume in NTGF series,[9] a survey of those findings and their significance for better understanding the transmission history of the Gospels during the second century in Alexandria are set forth in this chapter.

[4] B. D. Ehrman *et al.*, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1993); S. T. Raquel, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen' (Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002); Jared Anderson, 'The Origen-al Text of the Gospels: Origen's Witness to a Carefully Preserved New Testament Text in Alexandria' (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, New Orleans, 23 Nov. 2009).

[5] J. J. Brogan, 'The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius' (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1997).

[6] Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*.

[7] A. Cunningham, 'The New Testament Text of St. Cyril of Alexandria' (Ph.D. diss., University of Manchester, 1995).

[8] For a detailed account of the previous textual studies on Clement and their various strengths and inadequacies, see C. P. Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2008), 32–44.

[9] Ibid.

CLEMENT AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

Clement, whose full Latin name was Titus Flavius Clemens, was born around 150, perhaps in the city of Athens, though the evidence for this Athenian background is not entirely conclusive. Determined to gain a deeper knowledge of Christianity, Clement travelled across the Mediterranean studying under at least six different teachers. Sometime around 180, Clement arrived in Alexandria, Egypt, where he studied under Pantaenus. Over the next few years, Clement progressed from pupil, to assistant, and finally upon the death of Pantaenus to the new headmaster of the so-called Alexandrian 'school' himself. Clement remained in Alexandria for approximately twenty-two years. During that time, he established himself as a prolific author, producing a number of books in defense of his understanding of the Christian faith. Clement's tenure in Alexandria came to an abrupt close with the persecution of Christians during the reign of the emperor Septimus Severus in 202 or 203. Fleeing from Alexandria, Clement found refuge in Cappadocia where he lived for nearly ten years before his death.

Clement's flight to Cappadocia, as well as his travels across the Mediterranean before his arrival in Alexandria, raises the question of whether his biblical citations are an accurate representation of the text of the New Testament *in* Alexandria. To potentially complicate matters even more, while most of Clement's writings were written in Alexandria, it is not entirely certain that all of them were. Did Clement make use of different manuscripts for his non-Alexandrian writings, as Origen clearly seems to have done with his text of Mark after he moved to Caesarea? In regards to the latter question, the evidence suggests the answer is no. An examination and comparison of the biblical citations in each of Clement's books does not reveal any type of substantial change that might suggest Clement's text changed over the course of his life. And while it is possible that Clement may have become familiar with a form of the New Testament before his arrival in Alexandria, his citations can still provide a picture of the biblical text in Alexandria, for any form of the text Clement may have known before coming to Alexandria certainly became part of the text that was *in* circulation in Alexandria.

Although Clement lived at a time when the boundaries of the New Testament scriptures were not as sharply defined as they are today, he certainly was well acquainted with most of the twenty-seven books that comprise our modern New Testament canon. Regardless of the subject under discussion, Clement constantly alludes to passages from the New Testament scriptures or quotes them directly. In total, Clement's writings contain over 3,200 references to the New Testament writings. That number includes 1,579 references to the Gospels, 57 to the book of Acts, 1,372 of the Pauline Epistles (including

Hebrews), 237 to the General Epistles, and 34 to Revelation.[10] Philemon, James, 2nd Peter, and 3rd John are the only New Testament writings not clearly mentioned. Based on the sheer number of his citations, Clement's favorite canonical Gospel, like many other early Christians, appears to have been the Gospel of Matthew.

Clement's references to the New Testament reveal four basic observations about his citation habits: (1) Clement was so immersed in the New Testament, particularly the words of Jesus, that the words of the text became part and parcel of his own vocabulary; (2) Clement often cites from memory with varying degrees of accuracy; (3) while at other times, and particularly in the Pauline Epistles, Clement's quotations appear to come directly from a manuscript before him; and finally (4) some of Clement's quotations indicate a dependence on a oral catechetical tradition and at other times a deliberate altering of the text to better emphasize his own theological understanding of the meaning of the text. Space allows me the opportunity to comment only in limited detail on a few of these observations.[11]

Evidence that Clement likely committed portions of the New Testament to memory can be seen in some of the ways he makes use of the text. An obvious illustration of this is seen where Clement mistakenly attributes a citation from one author to another. In *Strom.* 3.30.3, for example, Clement attributes the words of Jesus in John 8: 34 to Paul. The similarity between John 8: 34 and Rom. 6: 16 is likely the source of Clement's mistaken attribution—a blunder that would surely not occur if he were quoting directly from a biblical manuscript. Other indications of Clement's reliance on his memory when citing scripture include: conflation between the words of two or more passages, the occasional use of ambiguous citation formulae ('it says somewhere in scripture'), his many deviations from all known manuscript readings, as well as the loose nature of some of his citations.

While Clement often relies upon his memory when citing from the New Testament, at times he also makes use of a number of quotation techniques that indicate he was relying on a manuscript before him. Evidence for this is seen in the introductory formulae Clement occasionally uses to introduce a quotation from the New Testament. His most frequent introductory formulae include εὐαγγελίω and φησὶν ὁ κύριος.[12] When Clement employs either of

[10] A. Brooks, 'Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon', *SecCent* 9 (1992): 47.

[11] For a more complete presentation of the evidence, see Cosaert, *Text of the Gospels*, 24–32.

[12] According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, the expression εὐαγγελίω occurs eighteen times in reference to the New Testament Gospels, while φησὶν ὁ κύριος appears almost an equal number of times at seventeen. For a study of other introductory formulae in Clement's writing, see A. van den Hoek, 'Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria. A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods', *VC* 50 (1996): 223–43. For a detailed list of each introductory formulae and their occurrence in Clement's writings, see Cosaert, *Text of the Gospels*, 28–9.

these formulae, his quotations usually have a higher degree of verbal accuracy with readings extant today than passages lacking them.

The most surprising characteristic of Clement's citation habits, however, is the differing degrees of accuracy between Clement's citations from the Pauline Epistles and the Gospels. Clement's citations of the Pauline Epistles, when accompanied by introductory formulae, are almost always more in agreement with readings extant today than are his quotations of the Gospels. For example, while the introductory formula γέγραπται consistently introduces verbally accurate citations from the Pauline Epistles, of the six times it is used in connection to the Gospels it never introduces an exact quotation.

Why does Clement treat his citations of the Gospels and Paul's writings so differently? Two reasons are likely involved. The first reason seems to be related to the inherent difference between the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. The parallel terminology and stories of the Synoptic Gospels led Clement, like many other Christians, to conflate, harmonize, and summarize the similar accounts of Jesus' words. The Pauline Epistles certainly do not present this kind of problem. This may also help to explain the clear textual distinction in Clement's text of John as opposed to the more muddled textual picture of his text of the Synoptics.

Another reason for the difference between Clement's citations of the Gospels and Paul's writings emerges in a hypothesis drawn from the evidence by Tollinton. Tollinton remarks:

> the Lord's teaching was for Clement the most authoritative and important element in the whole collection of the Scriptures. It is, therefore, antecedently probable that his familiarity with the Bible will here be at its highest, and his tendency to quote *memoriter* consequently more pronounced than elsewhere. This is borne out by the fact that his quotations from the Gospels (and these are mainly quotations of teachings: incidents are referred to but rarely in the *ipsissima verba* of the text) are less closely in accordance with the MSS. than quotations from other New Testament books.[13]

Viewed from this perspective, Clement's more precise quotations of Paul are not the result of a higher value placed on Paul's writings, but evidence of the primacy of the words of Jesus for Clement; Clement is simply more familiar with the words of Jesus than he is with those of Paul. While Clement's knowledge of Jesus' words obviously originates with a written text, Clement has come to know them so well that at times he feels little need to refer to a given text when referring to them.

At first this might seem nonsensical; if the words mattered that much to Clement, why does he show so little concern at times for citing them more exactly? Here it is important to remember, as Charles Hill has already pointed

[13] R. B. Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria* (2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1914), ii. 183–4.

out earlier in this volume in his chapter on literary borrowing, the modification of a citation by a second-century author does not necessarily indicate a low regard for the actual words of a text. On the contrary, it was Clement's high regard for the text that made him willing to adapt his citations so that the meaning of the text might be made more explicit.

CLEMENT'S TEXTUAL AFFINITIES IN THE GOSPELS

With a basic overview of Clement's life and citation habits in mind, we now turn to the nature of his textual affinities within the Gospels. The following results are based on what is now the standard methodology for patristic analysis. This process included identifying Clement's Gospel citations, adaptations, and significant allusions, and then collating them against the standard textual representatives from the major textual families. In order to determine whether a common form of the New Testament existed among the church fathers at Alexandria, Clement's text was also collated against the readings of Origen, Athanasius, Didymus, and Cyril identified in similar patristic studies. While the readings of these fathers were included in the textual apparatus and in the initial quantitative analysis, their testimony was not included in the quantitative analysis and group profiles that arrange the witnesses by textual group.[14]

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF CLEMENT'S GOSPEL CITATIONS

The initial quantitative analysis of Clement's Gospel citations revealed a surprising discovery: unlike previous examinations of the other Alexandrian fathers, Clement's text of the Gospels, as a whole, shares no overall agreement with any one of the specific text types. In Matthew, Clement's strongest affinity is with the Alexandrian text type, though his level of agreement with the Byzantine readings is nearly as strong. In Mark and Luke, Clement aligns more with the Western text type; while in John, Clement's text is strongly Alexandrian. The results from the quantitative analysis are listed in Tables 21.1–4.[15]

[14] These results are set forth in full, along with a complete critical apparatus, in Cosaert, *Text of the Gospels*, 57–218.

[15] For a more detailed analysis and explanation of the method of quantitative analysis, ibid. 219–50.

Table 21.1. Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with Clement in Genetically Significant Variation in Matthew (118 Units of Variation)

1.	Ath	7/9	77.8%		14.	Did	22/38	57.9%	
2.	Or	43/65	66.2%		15.	92	67/118	56.8%	SA
3.	א	73/116	62.9%	PA		33	63/111	56.8%	SA
4.	UBS^4	74/118	62.7%	PA	16.	*Θ*	65/116	56.0%	C
5.	*Π*	68/109	62.4%	B		f^{13}	65/116	56.0%	C
6.	TR	73/118	61.9%	B	17.	א^c	66/118	55.9%	SA
7.	*Ω*	72/118	61.0%	B		f1	66/188	55.9%	C
8.	B	71/117	60.7%	PA	18.	1582	64/116	55.2%	C
9.	C	46/76	60.5%	SA	19.	L	56/105	53.3%	SA
10.	E	70/117	59.8%	B	20.	a	47/96	49.0%	W
11.	k	31/52	59.6%	W	21.	e	20/42	47.6%	W
12.	*Δ*	67/114	58.8%	B	22.	b	47/100	47.0%	W
13.	D	61/105	58.1%	W	23.	A	7/15	46.7%	B

Table 21.2. Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with Clement in Genetically Significant Variation in Mark (47 Units of Variation)

1.	f13	28/44	63.6%	C	12.	C	24/47	51.1%	SA
2.	b	26/41	63.4%	W		f^1	24/47	51.1%	C
3.	TR	29/47	61.7%	B		1582	24/47	51.1%	C
	E	29/47	61.7%	B	13.	*Π*	23/46	50.0%	B
4.	Or	3/5	60.0%			33	2/4	50.0%	SA
5.	892	28/47	59.6%	SA		L	1/2	50.0%	SA
6.	*Ω*	19/32	59.4%	B		א	21/42	50.0%	PA
7.	D	27/46	58.7%	W	14.	א^c	22/45	48.9%	SA
8.	k	23/40	57.5%	W		*Ψ*	22/45	48.9%	SA
9.	A	25/47	53.2%	B	15.	*Δ*	21/45	46.7%	SA
	B	25/47	53.2%	PA	16.	*Θ*	20/46	43.5%	C
	UBS^4	25/47	53.2%	PA	17.	e	0/0	0.0%	W
10.	a	20/38	52.6%	W		Ath	0/0	0.0%	
11.	579	24/46	52.2%	SA		Did	0/0	0.0%	

Table 21.3. Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with Clement in Genetically Significant Variation in Luke (143 Units of Variation)

1.	Or	25/35	71.4%		15.	𝔓^{75}	62/116	53.4%	PA
2.	D	89/134	66.4%	W	16.	*Π*	74/140	52.9%	B
3.	33	65/107	60.7%	SA	17.	e	63/120	52.5%	W
4.	Did	17/29	58.6%		18.	f^{13}	73/141	51.8%	C
5.	א	81/141	57.4%	PA	19.	TR	74/143	51.7%	B
6.	f1	81/142	57.0%	C		A	74/143	51.7%	B
7.	a	67/118	56.8%	W	20.	*Θ*	73/143	51.0%	C
8.	*Ψ*	81/143	56.6%	SA	21.	B	71/142	50.0%	PA
9.	1582	80/143	55.9%	C		Ath	2/4	50.0%	
10.	א^c	79/143	55.2%	SA	22.	E	71/143	49.7%	B
11.	L	78/143	54.5%	SA	23.	*Δ*	70/142	49.3%	B
12.	b	66/122	54.1%	W	24.	579	65/134	48.5%	SA
13.	892	76/141	53.9%	SA	25.	𝔓^{45}	27/56	48.2%	C
14.	UBS^4	77/143	53.8%	PA	26.	C	14/32	43.8%	SA
	Ω	77/143	53.8%	B					

Table 21.4. *Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with* Clement in Genetically Significant Variation in John (72 Units of Variation)

1.	L	54/72	75.0%	SA	17.	A	35/57	61.4%	B
2.	33	52/70	74.3%	SA	18.	*Θ*	43/71	60.6%	C
3.	Or	29/40	72.5%			*Π*	42/71	60.6%	B
4.	C	33/46	71.7%	SA	19.	*Ω*	36/60	60.0%	B
5.	B	51/72	70.8%	PA	20.	E	43/72	59.7%	B
6.	Cyr	35/50	70.0%			TR	43/72	59.7%	B
7.	$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$	32/46	69.6%	PA	21.	*Δ*	41/72	56.9%	B
8.	UBS^4	50/72	69.4%	PA	22.	D	35/64	54.7%	W
9.	Ath	11/16	68.8%		23.	892	24/44	54.5%	SA
10.	*Ψ*	48/71	67.6%	SA	24.	ℵ	38/70	54.3%	
11.	1582	47/72	65.3%	C	25.	f^{13}	39/72	54.2%	C
12.	f1	46/71	64.8%	C	26.	$\mathfrak{P}^{45}$	3/6	50.0%	C
13.	W	34/53	64.2%	C	27.	Did	9/19	47.4%	
14.	$\aleph^{c}$	44/70	62.9%	SA	28.	e	26/59	44.1%	W
15.	$\mathfrak{P}^{66}$	33/53	62.3%	PA	29.	a	25/58	43.1%	W
16.	579	39/63	61.9%	SA	30.	b	23/59	39.0%	W

A clearer picture of Clement's textual affinities within each of the Gospels emerges when the individual witnesses are arranged according to their respective textual groups in Table 21.5. The most significant relationships for each Gospel are highlighted in bold font.[16]

While quantitative analysis reveals the diverse nature of Clement's text of the Synoptic Gospels, it is important to note that his highest levels of agreement still falls well below 65 percent—the minimum level of agreement established by scholars to firmly establish a dominant textual affinity.[17] For a witness, or in this case a church father, to be classified as a *bona fide* member of a textual group it/he must not only share a high level of agreement in genetically significant variants with other witnesses within one of the established text types, but it/he must also differ from nongroup members by a margin of 6–8 percent. This is simply not the case with Clement's Synoptic citations. How is this to be explained?

The variegated nature of Clement's text of the Synoptics may suggest a time when the transmission of the text was more fluid or transitional in nature—that is, instead of there being one dominant and established text of each of the Synoptics, there was still a competing number of diverse readings in circulation.

[16] Although the UBS^4 and the TR are not ancient witnesses themselves, they are included in these results since their eclectic texts clearly represent the Alexandrian and Byzantine text-types. Their inclusion (or exclusion) does not significantly alter any of the textual relationships. This can be seen in the fuller presentation of these same charts in Cosaert, *Text of the Gospels*.

[17] E. C. Colwell and E. W. Tune, 'The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-Types', in J. N. Birdsall and R. W. Thomson, eds., *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), 29; W. L. Richards, *The Classification of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 43–68; Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 202, 222.

Table 21.5. Proportional Agreement with Clement Arranged According to Text Group in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John (Agreement/Variants)

ALEXANDRIAN		
Primary		
Matthew	**218/133**	**62.1%**
Mark	71/65	52.2%
Luke	291/251	53.7%
John 8:39-21:25	185/278	66.5%
Secondary		
Matthew	298/230	56.4%
Mark	141/134	51.3%
Luke	458/385	54.3%
John	**328/489**	**67.1%**
CAESAREAN		
Matthew	260/206	55.8%
Mark	96/88	52.2%
Luke	334/291	53.4%
John	175/286	61.2%
BYZANTINE		
Matthew	**350/226**	**60.8%**
Mark	125/94	57.1%
Luke	441/416	51.5%
John	241/404	59.7%
WESTERN		
Matthew	206/189	52.2%
Mark	**96/69**	**58.2%**
Luke	**285/209**	**57.7%**
John 1:1-8:38	128/275	46.5%

The situation surrounding the transmission history of John's Gospel is different, however. Clement's strong affinity with the Alexandrian text type of John along with hardly any other significant textual influence suggests that the text of John was firmly established in Alexandria by the end of the second century.

GROUP PROFILE ANALYSIS OF CLEMENT'S GOSPEL CITATIONS

While quantitative analysis allows some preliminary conclusions to be drawn about the nature of Clement's text of the Gospels, it does not consider enough evidence for it to be conclusive on its own. Quantitative analysis is beset by two particular weaknesses: (1) its fixation on individual readings; and (2) its inability to exclude the possibility of accidental agreement in error. To offset these weaknesses, text critics have developed a supplemental method that

incorporates the examination of group readings that distinguish the four different text types, a method known as group profile analysis.

While a variety of group profile methodologies emerged over the course of the last century, Bart Ehrman's Comprehensive Profile Method continues to be the most successful in patristic textual studies.[18] The benefit of Ehrman's method is a threefold group profile analysis that examines the strength and extent of a reading's support in relation to each text type (the inter-group profile), the strength of a reading's attestation within a given text type, regardless of its support in other textual groups (the intra-group profile), and a combined profile that incorporates the strengths of each of the first two profiles. The thoroughness of Ehrman's method enables it either to clarify the ambiguity of the results of quantitative analysis, to provide a stronger confirmation of those results, or to provide a more precise assessment of the congruence of a father's text with the known text types. When this method was applied to Clement's text of the Gospels the following profiles emerged.

Profile One: Inter-Group Relationships

The first profile examines Clement's citations in relation to readings that are distinctive and exclusive, or primary. Readings that are distinctive or exclusive are those that are only present in one particular textual family. The difference between a distinctive and an exclusive reading is that the former reading has the support of more than half of the group members, while an exclusive reading only has the support of at least two group members. In contrast, primary readings are those that are shared by different groups, but with greater support in one textual group than another.

The frequency with which Clement supports the distinctive, exclusive, and primary reading of the five basic text types can be seen in Table 21.6. The highest overall agreement for each gospel is in bold.

What immediately stands out from this first profile is the small number of readings examined and the low level of agreement Clement shares with all the textual groups, only *two* are above 50 percent.[19] While this observation may be alarming at first, it is not that significant. In fact, it is even expected among the distinct and exclusive readings since seldom do all MSS of a given text type agree on a particular reading.[20] What is significant in this profile is the presence or absence of readings that characterize each particular text type,

[18] For a summary and evaluation of the various group profile methods, see Ehrman, 'Methodological Developments', 31–45; id., 'The Use of Group Profiles', 467–71.

[19] The specific biblical references for each of the readings identified in the three group profiles are listed in the more complete analysis in Cosaert, *Text of the Gospels*.

[20] Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 230.

Table 21.6. Profile One, Inter-Group Relationships

	Distinctive	Exclusive	Primary	Totals
Matthew				
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/0	6/13 (46.2%)	6/13 (46.2%)
Sec. Alex.	0/1	0/1 (0.0%)	2/7 (28.6%)	2/9 (22.2%)
Byzantine	0/1	0/1 (0.0%)	7/12 (58.3%)	7/14 (50.0%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/4 (0.0%)	1/4 (25.0%)	1/8 (12.5%)
Western	2/10 (20.0%)	4/18 (22.2%)	7/12 (58.3%)	13/40 (32.5%)
Mark				
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/0	3/9 (33.3%)	3/9 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)	0/2 (0.0%)	0/3 (0.0%)
Byzantine	0/1 (0.0%)	0/1 (0.0%)	1/6 (16.7%)	1/8 (12.5%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/3 (0.0%)	1/5 (16.7%)	1/8 (12.5%)
Western	2/4 (50.0%)	3/8 (37.5%)	5/8 (62.5%)	10/20 (50.0%)
Luke				
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)	10/29 (34.5%)	10/30 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/1 (0.0%)	0/3 (0.0%)	1/4 (25.0%)	1/8 (12.5%)
Byzantine	0/1 (0.0%)	0/3 (0.0%)	3/24 (12.5%)	3/28 (10.7%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/3 (0.0%)	1/6 (16.7%)	1/9 (11.1%)
Western	9/14 (64.3%)	5/15 (33.3%)	6/16 (37.5%)	20/45 (44.4%)
John				
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)	3/5 (60.0%)	3/6 (50.0%)
Sec. Alex	0/0	1/2 (50.0%)	2/2 (100.0%)	3/4 **(75.0%)**
Byzantine	0/1 (0.0%)	0/0 (0.0%)	2/6 (33.3%)	2/7 (28.6%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)	0/1 (0.0%)
Western	1/3 (33.3%)	2/14 (14.3%)	3/14 (21.4%)	6/31 (19.4%)

regardless of their level of agreement. Ideally one would expect a group witness frequently to preserve distinctive readings from one group, and rarely the distinctive readings from another group. In addition, a group witness should preserve a much higher attestation of the exclusive and primary readings of one group rather than those of another.

In light of these observations, it is surprising that, outside of a few Western readings, Clement does not preserve a *single* distinctive reading from any of the textual groups among the four Gospels. And among the exclusive readings, Clement supports only one of the two secondary Alexandrian readings. Though Clement does support a larger number of distinctive and exclusive Western readings, his support is nominal outside the distinctive readings in Luke. This means that Clement's textual affinities in the Gospels are largely based on primary readings—readings that are shared among the various text types.

A clearer picture of Clement's textual affinities within each Gospel appears when the results of the distinctive, exclusive, and primary readings are tabulated together. When this is done the following conclusions come to light.

First, the results of the first profile largely confirm the findings from the quantitative analysis, the sole difference being the slightly higher support of the Byzantine readings in Matthew (50.0%) than the primary Alexandrian readings (46.2%). It would be a mistake to conclude that this points to the early existence of the Byzantine text type, however. The fact that all but one of the Byzantine readings are primary readings indicates that these readings are not unique to the Byzantine text type—they are simply readings shared by the other textual families. What the evidence does point to is the antiquity of a number of Byzantine readings, a fact already demonstrated by the presence of some Byzantine readings in early papyri.[21]

Secondly, the first profile provides striking support for the strong Western influence on Clement's text of Mark and Luke. Of all the passages Clement cites in the Synoptic Gospels only a handful fall into the distinctive or exclusive categories. With the exception of his support for the Western readings, Clement fails to support a single one of these readings. In stark contrast, Clement supports over 64 percent of the distinctive Western readings in Luke and over 60 percent of the primary Western readings in Mark.

Finally, the meager level of Clement's support of either the distinctive, exclusive, or even primary Caesarean readings definitively rules out classifying Clement's text as Caesarean. This is, of course, no surprise since the Caesarean family of readings is not thought to have arisen until after Clement's time.

Profile Two: Intra-Group Relationships

One of the particular problems associated with the first group profile is the limited amount of data upon which it is based. A second profile (the Intra-Group Profile) overcomes the paucity of data within the first profile by looking at the proportional levels of a reading's attestation with a textual group regardless of its presence among the other groups. Two different groups of reading are profiled: uniform readings, those supported by *all* the witnesses

[21] In his study of 𝔓[46], Zuntz found a number of readings in agreement with later Byzantine readings. While some of these readings were discarded as late, when they recur in Western witnesses he argues they reproduce an ancient reading from before 'the emergence of separate Eastern and Western traditions' (G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (London: British Academy, 1953), 55–7, 150–1). This is a significant point, since Westcott and Hort discard Byzantine readings *en bloc* as late and secondary. It should be pointed out, however, that the presence of some Byzantine readings in early papyri does not point to the existence of an early Byzantine text-type, as Harry Sturz mistakenly concludes in *The Byzantine Text-type and New Testament Textual Criticism* (Nashville, Tenn.: Nelson, 1984). The Byzantine text-type only appears several hundred years later, around the time of Chrysostom, when Byzantine readings are no longer occasional but begin to appear as the dominant readings in MSS. Zuntz's conclusion is far more likely: some Byzantine readings must be ancient, and that the later Byzantine text originated not as a creation but as a process of choosing between early readings.

Table 21.7. Profile Two, Intra-Group Relationships

	Uniform	Predominant	Totals
Matthew			
Prim. Alex.	57/84 (67.9%)	16/32 (50.0%)	73/116 (62.9%)
Sec. Alex.	46/71 (64.8%)	13/30 (43.3%)	59/101 (58.4%)
Byzantine	54/87 (62.1%)	19/26 (73.1%)	73/113 **(64.6%)**
Caesarean	43/69 (62.3%)	17/27 (63.0%)	60/96 (62.5%)
Western	24/43 (55.8%)	12/30 (40.0%)	36/73 (49.3%)
Mark			
Prim. Alex.	19/32 (59.4%)	5/13 (38.5%)	24/45 (53.3%)
Sec. Alex.	14/26 (53.8%)	7/12 (58.3%)	21/38 (55.3%)
Byzantine	20/32 (62.5%)	4/8 (50.0%)	24/40 (60.0%)
Caesarean	13/20 (65.0%)	4/11 (36.4%)	17/31 (54.8%)
Western	8/12 (66.7%)	11/15 (73.3%)	19/27 **(70.4%)**
Luke			
Prim. Alex.	50/96 (61.5%)	15/37 (40.5%)	74/133 (55.6%)
Sec. Alex.	36/53 (67.9%)	26/53 (49.1%)	62/106 (58.5%)
Byzantine	52/93 (55.9%)	19/37 (51.4%)	71/130 (54.6%)
Caesarean	43/73 (58.9%)	23/36 (63.9%)	66/109 (60.6%)
Western	23/32 (71.9%)	30/40 (75.0%)	53/72 **(73.6%)**
John			
Prim. Alex.	34/47 (72.3%)	11/29 (57.9%)	45/66 (68.2%)
Sec. Alex.	27/33 (81.8%)	19/26 (73.1%)	46/59 **(78.0%)**
Byzantine	35/52 (67.3%)	6/14 (42.9%)	41/66 (62.1%)
Caesarean	31/44 (70.5%)	9/16 (56.3%)	40/60 (66.7%)
Western	6/10 (60.0%)	8/23 (34.8%)	14/13 (42.4%)

within a group, and predominant readings, those supported by at *least two-thirds* of a group's witnesses. Unlike the previous profile, the level of agreement is important and should, ideally, approach the 65 percent level suggested in the quantitative analysis. The results from the second profile are listed in Table 21.7.

When applied to Clement, the results from the second profile were of varying benefit. In the case of Matthew, for example, Clement's highest levels of agreement not only fall below 65 percent, but they are also nearly equally divided between the Byzantine, primary Alexandrian, and Caesarean readings in Matthew. The clearest result from this portion of the intra-group profile is that Clement's text of Matthew shows little influence from readings present in the Western textual tradition.

When applied to Mark and Luke, the second profile helped confirm the strong affinity Clement shares with the Western text. What is unusual, however, is that Clement's highest level of agreement is *not* among the uniform readings, but with the predominant readings. What makes this surprising is that to be classified as a clear member of the Western text type one would

expect Clement to support a greater number of uniform readings. Instead his slightly greater support of predominant Western readings—readings shared with other groups—suggests he may not be a particularly strong Western witness. The unusual nature of these results indicates that some degree of caution or further evaluation should be taken before simply identifying Clement's text as Western.

Finally, when applied to John the second profile also raised the need for caution before too quickly classifying Clement's text. While the profile confirmed the Alexandrian nature of Clement's text of John, the high number of predominant readings suggests that further analysis is also needed before identifying Clement's text of John as definitely secondary Alexandrian.

Profile Three: Uniform and Predominant Readings that are Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

The particular shortcoming of the second profile is the inflated level of support it gives to non-Western uniform and predominant readings due to the presence of a large number of exclusive and distinctive Western readings (readings where two or more Western witnesses provide support but no others) in early Christian manuscripts.[22] The third profile in Table 21.8 overcomes this weakness by combining the strength of the inter- and intra-group profiles; it examines the level of Clement's agreement with the uniform and predominant readings of each textual group that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary.[23]

The result of the third profile resembles, once again, the findings from the previous profiles and the quantitative analysis: Clement's strongest textual affinity in Matthew is closest to the Byzantine (53.8%) and primary Alexandrian readings (46.2%). While a margin of 7.6 percent separates the two

[22] This phenomenon can be seen by the number of Western distinctive and exclusive readings made evident by any comparison of Western readings against other textual groups. In the case of Clement, the first profile illustrates this point well. In Matthew alone, there are a total of twenty-eight distinctive and exclusive Western readings. In contrast, the accumulated total of all the other textual groups produces only eight readings—more than a three to one difference! In addition, the same point can be illustrated by a comparison of the distinctive and exclusive readings among the results of the first profile among the other gospels. To a much lesser degree, of course, the exclusive and distinctive readings among the other textual groups have a similar effect on the profile.

[23] As the totals indicate, this combination profile does reduce the exaggerated totals of the non-Western uniform and predominant readings from the intra-group profile. The number of Primary Alexandrian uniform and predominant readings drops from 116 to 13, Secondary Alexandrian readings from 101 to 5, Byzantine readings from 113 to 13, Caesarean readings from 96 to 2, and Western readings from 73 to 27. The decrease is not as significant among the Western readings since they have a larger number of uniform and predominant readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary.

Table 21.8. Uniform and Predominant Readings that are Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

	Uniform	Predominant	Totals
Matthew			
Prim. Alex.	3/7 (42.9%)	3/6 (50.0%)	6/13 (46.2%)
Sec. Alex.	1/1 (100%)	1/4 (25.0%)	2/5 (40.0%)
Byzantine	5/10 (50.0%)	2/3 (66.7%)	7/13 (53.8%)
Caesarean	0/2 (0.0%)	0/0	0/2 (0.0%)
Western	8/16 (50.0%)	2/11 (18.2%)	10/27 (37.0%)
Mark			
Prim. Alex.	1/5 (20.0%)	2/4 (50.0%)	3/9 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/1 (0.0%)	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)
Byzantine	1/3 (33.3%)	0/2 (00.0%)	1/5 (20.0%)
Caesarean	0/1 (0.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	1/4 (25.0%)
Western	2/5 (40.0%)	3/5 (60.0%)	5/10 (50.0%)
Luke			
Prim. Alex.	8/23 (34.8%)	2/5 (40.0%)	10/28 (35.7%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/2 (0.0%)	0/2 (0.0%)
Byzantine	3/13 (23.1%)	1/9 (11.1%)	4/22 (18.2%)
Caesarean	0/2 (0.0%)	1/1 (100.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Western	10/17 (58.8%)	6/10 (60.0%)	16/27 (59.3%)
John			
Prim. Alex.	2/3 (66.7%)	1/2 (50.0%)	3/5 (60.0%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/0	0/0
Byzantine	1/3 (33.3%)	0/2 (0.0%)	1/5 (20.0%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/0	0/0
Western	2/2 (100.0%)	3/12 (33.3%)	5/14 (35.7%)

groups, the margin of difference is not that significant when one takes into consideration the small number of readings being compared.

Although Clement's text of Matthew aligns most closely with the Byzantine and primary Alexandrian readings in each of the group profiles, his relatively low level of proportional agreement in the third profile, combined with the small number of distinctive and exclusive readings from the first profile, mitigates against an attempt to classify his text as solely Byzantine or primary Alexandrian. Instead, the information available through the group profile method again suggests that Clement's text in Matthew represents an early stage in the development of the textual tradition in Alexandria, a stage during which a 'reservoir'—following the imagery characterized by Zuntz—of different readings existed, including a number of early Byzantine readings that eventually disappeared from some later streams of the Alexandrian text type. If this is the case, it may also help to explain the shifting nature of Clement's textual affinities among the Synoptic Gospels. Before any such final conclusions can be drawn, however, a specific examination of each of the Byzantine readings Clement supports from the third profile and an assessment

of their relation/presence in the Alexandrian and Western traditions are necessary.

The third profile again shows Clement's textual proclivities are overwhelmingly aligned with the Western tradition in both Mark and Luke. Clement's support of the Western readings in Mark is 50 percent, while in Luke it reaches nearly 60 percent. In both cases the next closest level of support is among primary Alexandrian readings, but they are separated by a gap of roughly 20 percent. The Caesarean and Byzantine traditions have very minimal influence in these two Gospels.

Although the results of the group profile analysis suggest that Clement's affinities align closest with the Western text in Mark and Luke, there are still several reasons that caution against prematurely classifying his text as Western. For one, while Clement's overall level of agreement gives his text a definitive Western flavour, it is not all-encompassing. His text also reveals a limited, but noticeable, primary Alexandrian influence. Another significant factor is the rather loose way Clement quotes the passage in Mark 10. Though quoting the passage from memory, Clement's text reveals that he made a number of small, but frequent modifications to the text. This led Michael Mees, a previous scholar on Clement's text, to claim that Clement's so-called Western readings are not uniquely Western, but merely the result of his loose handling of the text.[24] More recently, Barbara Aland has also referred to many of these divergences as either examples of harmonization or mere 'banalities' that, in her opinion, 'go back to the rapid dictation of the author to his stenographer'.[25] Thus before any firm conclusion can be drawn about the strength of the Western influence on Clement's text of Mark and Luke, a further analysis is needed to determine whether Clement's attestations of the specific Western readings in the third profile are genuinely Western in origin or merely the accidental result of his loose quotation of the passage.

And finally the application of the third profile to Clement's text of John confirms the suspicion that arose in the previous two profiles about the classification of Clement's text as secondary Alexandrian. The complete absence of any secondary Alexandrian readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary obviates, of course, the identification of Clement's text with the secondary Alexandrian witnesses. Instead, Clement's strongest proclivities appear to reside with the primary Alexandrian witnesses, though, once again, the relatively low level of Clement's strongest proportional agreement fails to reach 65 percent.

[24] M. Mees, 'Das Matthaus-Evangelium in den Werken des Clemens Von Alexandrien', *DIV* 12/3 (1968): 693; 'Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P75) und die Lukaszitate bei Clemens von Alexandrien', *Lateranum,* 34 (1968): 112–13; Cosaert, *Text of the Gospels*, 42–3.

[25] B. Aland, 'The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History', in C. Horton, ed., *The Earliest Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 119–20.

While Clement's 60 percent proportional level of agreement with the primary Alexandrian readings in John falls 5 percentage points below the 65 percent suggested as the minimal level necessary for group classification, several pieces of evidence indicate that an Alexandrian classification is probably more correct for his text of John than any other classification. (1) Clement's rate of agreement (60%) and the margin of difference separating his top two agreements are higher in John than in the Synoptic Gospels. A margin of 24.3 percent separates Clement's level of agreement between the primary Alexandrian witnesses and his next closest agreement with the Western tradition (35.7%). (2) The third profile suggests that the various textual traditions play a very minimal influence on Clement's text of John. The only evidence from the third profile for any textual influence beyond the primary Alexandrian and Western traditions in John is one single Byzantine agreement. (3) Unlike the random nature of the witnesses ranked according to their proportional agreement with Clement in each of the Synoptic Gospels, the Alexandrian witnesses clearly dominate the highest levels of agreement as a unified block. While each of these pieces of evidence is far from conclusive individually, as a whole they make a strong case for an Alexandrian classification of Clement's text of John.

THE TYPOLOGY OF CLEMENT'S READINGS

The analysis of Clement's text of the Gospels provides some rather puzzling results. In every case, Clement's text of Synoptic Gospels not only fails to reach at least a 65 percent level of agreement with any one of the textual groups, but his highest level of proportional agreement also varies considerably among the Gospels: it switches from being predominately Byzantine/Alexandrian in Matthew, to Western in Mark 10 and Luke, and then to Alexandrian in John. These findings were very different from the clear and consistent results found in the study of other Alexandrian fathers. What should we make of these results?

There appear to be two possibilities that need to be taken into consideration before any final conclusions are drawn. First, Clement's textual relationships may not be clear because the readings that largely determine his textual classification are not distinct or exclusive to any one textual group. They are readings that are shared among the text types. Therefore a reading that is identified as Byzantine might really be a minor Alexandrian reading. A second possibility is that some of Clement's readings identified as Western or Byzantine may simply be the result of happenstance, and therefore not genuine readings.

Table 21.9. Typology of Clement's Readings: Sample Findings

Matt 12:36	
A.	λαλησωσιν E (L) Δ Π Ω f^1 f^{13} 892 1582 TR (Or)
B.	*λαλησουσιν ℵ B C (D) Θ 33 a b k UBS^4
Form alteration	
Luke 10:21	
A.	*εν τω πνευματι 𝔓^{45vid} ℵ D L 33 892 (a) (b) (e) UBS^4
B.	τω πνευματι 𝔓^{75} A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f^1 f^{13} 579 1582 TR
Grammatical change: addition of a preposition	
Luke 10:42	
A.	*αυτης ℵ* B D L 579 (a) (b) (e) UBS^4
B.	απ αυτης 𝔓^{75} ℵ^c A C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f^1 f^{13} 33 892 1582 TR [Lac. 𝔓^{45}]
Grammatical change: omission of a preposition	

In light of these possibilities, the thirty-one readings in the third group profile that identified Clement's textual affinity in Matthew as Byzantine, in Mark and Luke as Western, and in John as Alexandrian were re-examined. The goal of this additional examination was to determine if these readings were genuinely supportive of the textual groups they were identified as representing. Table 21.9 provides an example of how each of these readings was re-evaluated.

In each of the examples in Table 21.9 it immediately becomes apparent that the readings under consideration are ones that are shared by several text types. In Matthew 12: 36, the identification of Clement's reading as Byzantine is clearly questionable. The variant has relatively strong support among two of the other textual groups; it also has the support of three-quarters of the Caesarean and half of the secondary Alexandrian readings. Thus for classification purposes, Clement's text is probably not 'best' classified as Byzantine. It probably more accurately represents an early and divergent channel of the Alexandrian tradition that was ultimately preserved in the Byzantine text.

In the case of the two examples listed from Luke, Clement's readings are also hardly convincing examples of his attestation of the Western text. In both cases, the readings are simply too minor to make them a decisive factor of Clement's reliance on Western readings. Not to mention the fact that the readings are also found in several Alexandrian witnesses.

The re-examination of each of the thirty-one readings used in the third profile to identify Clement's strongest textual affinities in the Gospels revealed that the proportional levels of Clement's textual affinities were somewhat misleading and in need of minor adjustment, at least in the Synoptics. In the Synoptics, two of the readings from Matthew were determined not to accurately represent Clement's affinity with the Byzantine text. In addition two of the readings in Mark and two in Luke were also found to be not completely accurate in assessing Clement's affinity with the Western text. In contrast, the

Table 21.10. Adjusted Group Profile Analysis

	Uniform	Predominant	Totals
Matthew			
Prim. Alex.	3/7 (42.9%)	3/6 (50.0%)	6/13 (46.2%)
Sec. Alex.	1/1 (100%)	1/4 (25.0%)	2/5 (40.0%)
Byzantine	3/8 (37.5%)	2/3 (66.7%)	5/11 (45.5%)
Caesarean	0/2 (0.0%)	0/0	0/2 (0.0%)
Western	8/16 (50.0%)	2/11 (18.2%)	10/27 (37.0%)
Mark			
Prim. Alex.	1/5 (20.7%)	2/4 (50.0%)	3/9 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/1 (0.0%)	0/0	0/1(0.0%)
Byzantine	1/3 (33.3%)	0/2 (0.0%)	1/5 (20.0%)
Caesarean	0/1 (0.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	1/4 (25.0%)
Western	2/5 (40.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	3/8 (37.5%)
Luke			
Prim. Alex.	8/23 (34.8%)	2/5 (40.0%)	10/28 (35.7%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/2 (0.0%)	0/2 (0.0%)
Byzantine	3/13 (23.1%)	1/9 (11.1%)	4/22 (18.2%)
Caesarean	0/2 (0.0%)	1/1 (100.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Western	6/13 (46.2%)	4/8 (50.0%)	10/21 (47.6%)

clear nature of Clement's primary Alexandrian readings in John indicated that no adjustment was needed to his proportional level of Alexandrian agreement. The results of these various adjustments are found in Table 21.10 and reflect a more diverse picture of the textual influences present in Alexandria than the original group profile method was able to indicate.

CONCLUSIONS

One of the most interesting findings from examining Clement's text of the Gospels was the high degree of textual confluence Clement shares with the later Alexandrian fathers. While a comparison of the text of one Alexandrian father with another has been done before, this study allowed for a specific type of quantitative comparison that has not been done previously; building on the results of recent patristic studies that were based on the same methodology it was possible to compare the level of textual agreement for each father Gospel by Gospel.[26] As the summary of the quantitative analysis shows in Table 21.11,

[26] This type of comparative analysis was impossible before the methodology developed by Ehrman became the standard for patristic analysis. The publication of the series The New Testament in the Greek Fathers (SBLNTGF) will hopefully encourage future patristic studies that can build on these comparisons and open the door for a clearer picture of the history of the text of the New Testament.

Table 21.11. Clement's Proportional Agreement with Alexandrian Fathers in Genetically Significant Gospel Variants

Matthew			
1.	Ath	7/9	77.8%
2.	Or	43/65	66.2%
14.	Did	22/38	57.9%
Mark			
4.	Or	3/5	60.0%
Luke			
1.	Or	25/35	71.4%
4.	Did	17/29	58.6%
21.	Ath	2/4	50.0%
John			
3.	Or	29/40	72.5%
6.	Cyr	35/50	70.0%
9.	Ath	11/16	68.8%
27.	Did	9/19	47.4%

with very few exceptions,[27] Clement shares his highest levels of agreement with other Alexandrian fathers.

The consistently high rate of agreement between these fathers should not be dismissed as merely coincidental. When dealing with patristic evidence one would expect often to find a low rate of agreement between two fathers.[28] This is due to the inconsistent citation practices and varying preferences for certain New Testament books and passages, as well as the fact that a vast number of patristic citations tend to be adaptations and loose quotations that drastically reduce the chances of a high rate of agreement.

The comparison of Clement with these other Alexandrian fathers (see Table 21.11) reveals that a significant textual relationship exists among them and the so-called Alexandrian text.[29] While this relationship deserves a far more detailed analysis, it does suggest that Clement's text of the Gospels may have a stronger affinity to the Alexandrian text than the extant evidence is able to indicate. This intriguing possibility highlights the need for additional studies on the textual relationships of the Alexandrian fathers.

[27] In the case of the Synoptics, the only deviation from this pattern is the lower level of agreement Clement shares with Athanasius in Luke. Little can be made of this lower rate of agreement, however, since only four variants are available for consideration. The only real anomaly in John is the 47.4% rate of agreement Clement shares with Didymus. This also does not undermine the confluence of Clement with the other Alexandrian fathers since Didymus' text in John, as Ehrman notes, is highly eclectic (see Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 215–16). Clement and the other Alexandrian fathers, however, favour a more strongly Alexandrian text in John.

[28] e.g. the 59.3% rate of agreement shared between Basil and Gregory of Nyssa (see Racine, *Text of Matthew*, 283–6).

[29] See the recent textual analysis of each of these fathers for the Alexandrian nature of their Gospel texts.

The most significant conclusion that can be drawn from the re-examination of Clement's text of the Gospels is that Clement's text was not monolithic. Instead of testifying to the dominance of one singular text type, Clement's citations suggest an awareness of a number of diverse readings in circulation, and Clement does not appear to have been beholden to the sole influence of any one of them. And while some of the diversity of Clement's text is certainly the result of his tendency toward harmonization among the Synoptic Gospels, the vast majority of his support of the various text types cannot simply be explained as accidental.

As the evidence now stands, Clement's citations suggest that the primary Alexandrian text of John was dominant by the end of the second century in Alexandria, though Clement was a rather impure representative of it. At the same time, the variegated nature of Clement's text of the Synoptic Gospels points to a time of freer text-forms with a wide variety of different readings in circulation together in Alexandria. Of course, this does not suggest that the text was in some kind of complete free fall. The evidence does not go that far. Instead, it points to a time of textual fluidity with two major textual streams present: primary Alexandrian and Western. These two traditions, including a few ancient Byzantine readings, exerted varying levels of influence upon Clement's text—in particular, a stronger primary Alexandrian influence in Matthew and a slightly stronger Western influence in Mark 10 and in Luke, although in no case was one textual tradition so overwhelmingly influential that it would justify classifying Clement's text as either Alexandrian or Western. The limited influence of the Western text on the Synoptics in Alexandria, as seen in Clement's writings, would be short-lived, however. Within a century, the Western tradition would play little, if any, role on the text of the Gospels in Alexandria. Whether church fathers such as Origen or other unknown forces contributed to this change remains a mystery still waiting to be solved.

Bibliography

Achtemeier, Paul J., *1 Peter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996).

Aland, Barbara, 'Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papyri, demonstriert am Johannesevengelium', in Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch (eds.), *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism New Testament: Other Early Christian and Jewish Literature. Papers Read at a Noster Conference in Münster, January 4–6* (STAR 7; Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2005), 19–38.

—— 'Die Münsteraner Arbeit am Text des Neuen Testaments und ihr Beitrag für die frühe Überlieferung des 2. Jahrhunderts: Eine methodologische Betrachtung', in William L. Petersen (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1989), 55–70.

—— 'Die Rezeption des neutestamentlichen Textes in den ersten Jahrhunderten', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1989), 1–38.

—— 'Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft des sog. westlichen Textes – untersucht an der Apostelgeschichte', *ETL* 62 (1986): 5–65.

—— 'Kriterien zur Beurteilung *kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments*', in Adelbert Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 1–13.

—— 'Marcion *(ca. 85–160)*/Marcioniten', *TRE* 22/1 (1992): 90.

—— 'Marcion-Marcionites-Marcionism', in Angelo Di Berardino (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church,* tr. Adrian Walford (2 vols. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1992), i. 523–4.

—— 'The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History', in Charles Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels. The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P45* (JSNTSup 258; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 108–21.

Aland, Kurt, ed., 'Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im Neuen Testament: Betrachtungen zu P69 und 0171', in Sebastià Janeras (ed.), *Miscellània papirològica Ramón Roca-Puig* (Barcelona: Fundacio Salvador Vives Casajuana, 1987), 37–61.

—— 'Bemerkungen zum Alter und zur Entstehung des Christogramms anhand von Beobachtungen bei 𝔓66 und 𝔓75', in Kurt Aland (ed.), *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1967), 173–9.

—— 'Der neue "Standard-Text" in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln', in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 257–75.

—— 'Die Bedeutung des P^{75} für den Text des Neuen Testaments: Ein Beitrag zur Frage des "Western Non-Interpolations" ', in Kurt Aland (ed.), *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967), 155–62.

—— 'Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II', *NTS* 12 (1965–6): 193–210.

—— 'Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III', *NTS* 22 (1975–6): 375–96.
—— *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (ANTT 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967).
—— ed., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments III: Die Apostelgeschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993).
—— ed., *Text und Textwert,* i. *Die katholischen Briefe*, 1. *Das Material: Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments,* i, ii/1, ii/2, iii (ANTF 9, 10, 11; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987).
—— and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticisms*, tr. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989, 1995).
—— and —— *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*, i. *Biblische Papyri*, *Altes Testament, Neues Testament, Varia, Apokryphen* (PTS18; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976).
—— ——, Johannes Karavidopulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds., NA^{27} (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993, 2001).
—— —— —— —— and —— eds., UBS^{4} (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).
—— ——, and Klaus Wachtel, *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments,* iv. *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 3.2. *Das Lukasevangelium* (ANTF 31; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999).
—— —— *and* —— *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften,* v/1, 2 (ANT 36; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005).
—— M. Welle, B. Köester, and K. Junack, eds. *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments,* 2nd rev. and enl. (ANTF 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994): http://intf.uni-muenster.de/vmr/NTVMR/ListeHandschriften.php.
Alexander, Loveday, 'Ancient Book Production and Circulation of the Gospels', in Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for all Christians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 71–105.
American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, eds., *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (2 vols. The New Testament in Greek, 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984–87).
Amphoux, Christian-Bernard, 'La Finale longue de Marc: Un épilogue des quatre évangiles', in Camille Focant (ed.), *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 548–55.
—— 'Le Chapitre 24 de *Luc* et l'origine de la tradition textuelle du *Codex de Bèze* (D.05 du NT)', *Fil Neo* 4 (1991): 21–49.
—— 'Le Texte', in D. C. Parker and Christian-Bernard Amphoux (eds.), *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 337–54.
—— and James K. Elliot, eds., *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003).
Amundsen, L., 'Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection', *SO* 24 (1945): 121–40.
Arcieri, Mike, 'The Text of Didymus the Blind in the Book of Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse', Ph.D. diss., McGill University, 2007.
Armitage-Robinson, J., and Montague Rhodes James, *The Gospel According to Peter, and the Revelation of Peter* (London: Clay & Sons, 1892).
Attridge, H.W., 'The Greek Fragments', in *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2–7, together with XIII,2*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926 (1) and P.Oxy. 1, 654, 655* (NHS 20, ed. B. Layton; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 103–9.

Aucher, J. B., and G. Moesinger, *Evangelii Concordantis Expositio facta a Sancto Ephraemo Doctore Syro* (Venice: Mechitarists of San Lazzaro, 1876).

Aune, David E., *Revelation 17–22* (World Biblical Commentary, 52c; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1998).

Avinery, Iddo, 'The Position of the Demonstrative Pronoun in Syriac', *JNES* 34 (1975): 123–7.

Baarda, Tjitze, '"Abraham has Seen you?" John 8: 56–59 in a Letter of al-Ḥasan b. Ayyũb', *NovT*, vol 53 (2011), 390–402.

—— 'An Archaic Element in the Arabic Diatessaron? (T^A 46:18 = John xv.2)', *NovT* 17 (1975): 151–5.

—— 'A "Non-Canonical Version" of Luke 7: 42b? The Reading '*τίνα* [*αὐτῶν*] *πλεῖον ἠγάπησεν*", in Adelbert Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, *Festschrift Joel Delobel* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 97–129.

—— 'Another Treatise of Aphrahat the Persian Sage in Ethiopic Translation', *NTS* 27 (1980–1): 632–40.

—— '*ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ–ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ*: Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian', in William L. Petersen (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (London: University of Notre Dame, 1989), 133–56.

—— 'Gadarenes, Gerasenes, Gergesenes and the Diatessaron Traditions', in Earle E. Ellis and Max E. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Principal Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1969), 181–97.

—— 'Geven als vreemdeling: Over de herkomst van een merkwaardige variant van Ms. 713 in Mattheus 17,26', *NedTT* 42/2 (1988): 99–113.

—— 'John 1: 5 in the Oration and Diatessaron of Tatian, Concerning the Reading *καταλαμβάνει*', *VC* 47 (1993): 209–25.

—— 'John 8: 57B. The Contribution of the Diatessaron of Tatian', *NovT* 38/4 (1996): 36–343.

—— 'Matthew 18: 14c, An Extra-canonical Addition in the Arabic Diatessaron?', *Le Muséon,* 107 (1994): 135–49.

—— 'The Author of the Arabic Diatessaron', in Tjitze Baarda, W. C. van Unnik, and A. F. J. Klijn (eds.), *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, i (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 61–103.

—— 'The Diatessaron of Tatian: Source for an Early Text at Rome or Source of Textual Corruption', in Christian-Bernard Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott (eds.), *The New Text in Early Christianity* (Lausanne: Zèbre, 2003), 93–139.

—— *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat, the Persian Sage*, i. *Aphrahat's Text of the Fourth Gospel*. Thesis defended 18 Apr. 1975, The Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

—— 'The Text of John 5,7 in the Liège Harmony: Two Studies in the Thesis of Daniël Plooij', *ETL* 81/4 (2005): 491–502.

—— 'To the Roots of the Syriac Diatessaron Tradition (T^A 25: 1–3)', *NovT* 28 (1986): 111–32.

—— *Vier = Een. Enkele bladzijden uit de geschiedenis van de harmonisitiek der Evangeliën* (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1969).

—— 'What Kind of Critical Apparatus for the New Testament do we Need? The Case of Luke 23: 48', in Barbara Aland and J. Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History* (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994), 37–97.

Bagnall, Roger S., *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

Baldus, Aloys, *Das Verhältnis Justins des Märtyrers zu unsern synoptischen Evangelien* (Münster, Press 1895).

Barker, Don, 'How Long and Old is the Codex of which P.Oxy. 1353 is a Leaf?', in Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, ed.(London: T&T Clark, 2009), 192–202.

Barnes, Timothy D., 'Pre-Decian *Acta Martyrum*', *JTS*NS 19 (1968): 509–31.

—— *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971).

Barrett, Charles K., *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: A&C Black, 1973).

—— *The Acts of the Apostles* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–8).

Bauckham, Richard J., *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

—— 'John for Readers of Mark', in Richard J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 147–71.

—— *Jude, 2 Peter* (Waco, Tex.: Word, 1983).

—— *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

Bauer, Walter, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Early Christianity*, ed. R. A. Kraft and tr. G. Krodel (Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).

—— Review of Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott, Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen,* 185 (1923): 1–14.

Baumeister, Theofried, 'Der Brief an die Gemeinden von Vienne und Lyon und die Offenbarung des Johannes', in F. W. Horn and M. Wolter (eds.), *Studien zur Johannesoffenbarung und ihrer Auslegung: Festschrift für Otto Böcher zum 70. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2005), 339–55.

Beard, Mary, *Literacy in the Roman World*, ed. J. H. Humphrey (Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archeology, 1991), and in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

—— 'Writing and Religion: Ancient Religion and the Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion', in Mary Beard *et al.* (eds.), *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991), 353–8.

Bell, H., Idris, and T. C. Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri* (London: British Museum, 1935).

—— *The New Gospel Fragments* (London: British Museum, 1955).

Bellinzoni, Arthur J., 'The Gospel of Matthew in the Second Century', *SecCent* 9 (1992): 197–258.

—— *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (NovTSup 17; Leiden: Brill, 1967).

Benecke, P. V. M., 'The Epistle of Polycarp', in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905), 84–104.

Berding, Kenneth, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

Bernhard, Andrew, *Other Early Christian Gospels: A Critical Edition of the Surviving Greek Manuscripts* (London: T&T Clark, 2006).

Beyschlag, Karlmann, ‘Marcion von Sinope’, in Martin Greschat (ed.), *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte*, i. *Alte Kirche I* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984), 69–81.

Bickell, Gustav, ‘Das Nichtkanonische Evangelien-Fragment’, in Joseph von Karabacek (ed.), *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, 1.3–4 (Vienna: K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1887), 53–61.

Binder, G., ‘Offentliche Autorenlesungen: Zur Kommunikation zwischen romischen Autoren und ihrem Publikum’, in G. Binder and K. Ehlich (eds.), *Kommunikation durch Zeichen und Wort* (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1995), 265–332.

Bingham, D. Jeffrey, *Irenaeus’ Use of Matthew’s Gospel in Adversus Haereses* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998).

Birdsall, J. Neville, *Collected Papers in Greek and Georgian Textual Criticism* (TS III/3; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006).

—— ‘The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John’, in *Collected Papers in Greek and Georgian Textual Criticism* (TS III/3; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006), 57–72. Repr. of *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John* (London: Tyndale, 1960).

—— ‘The Text of Jude in P72’, *JTS* 14 (1963): 394–9.

—— ‘The Text of the Revelation of St. John: A Review of its Materials and Problems with Special Reference to the Work of Josef Schmid’, *EvQ* 33 (1961): 228–37.

—— ‘The Western Text in the Second Century’, in William L. Petersen (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (CJA 3; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1989), 3–17.

Birt, Theodor, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhaltniss zur Litteratur* (Berlin: Hertz, 1882).

Black, Matthew, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967).

Blackman, Edwin C., *Marcion and his Influence* (London: SPCK, 1948).

Blanck, H., *Das Buch in der Antike* (Munich: Beck, 1992).

Blumenthal, H. J., ‘Plotinus in Later Platonism’, in H. J. Blumenthal and R. A. Markus (eds.), *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought* (London: Variorum, 1981), 212–20.

Bouriant, M. U., ‘Fragments du texte grec du livre d’Enoch et de quelques écrits attributes à Saint Pierre’, in Edouard Naville *et al.* (eds.), *Mémoires publiés par les members de la Mission archéologique française au Caire,* 9/1 (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892), 137–47.

Bousset, Wilhelm, *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1891).

Braun, François-Marie, *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l’Église ancienne* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1959).

Brockmeyer, N., ‘Die soziale Stellung der “‘Buchhandler’” in der Antike’, *AGBL* 13 (1973): 238–48.

Brogan, John Jay, ‘The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius’, Ph.D. diss., Duke University Press, 1997.

Brooks, J. A., ‘Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon’, *SecCent* 9/1 (1992): 41–55.

—— 'The Text of the Four Gospels as Quoted in the "Moralia" of Basil the Great', Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 1961.

Bovon, François, 'Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect', *HTR* 85 (1992): 175–96.

Brown, Schuyler, 'Concerning the Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*', *SPap* 9 (1970): 7–19.

Brox, Norbert, ed., *Ireneus: Against Heresies* (5 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1996–2001).

Bruce, F. F., *Tradition: Old and New* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970).

—— 'Tradition and the Canon of Scripture', in D. K. McKim (ed.), *The Authoritative Word: Essays on the Nature of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 59–84.

Bruce, L., 'Palace and Villa Libraries from Augustus to Hadrian', *Journal of Library History,* 21 (1986): 510–52.

Buck, L., 'The Pagan Husband in Justin Apology, 2,1–20', *JTS* 53 (2002): 541–6.

Buckley, E. R., 'Justin Martyr's Quotations from the Synoptic Tradition', *JTS* 36 (1935): 173–6.

Burton, Philip, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of Their Texts and Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Byrskog, Samuel, *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

Cahill, Michael, 'The First Markan Commentary', *RB* 101 (1994): 258–68.

—— *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Callmer, Christian, 'Antike Bibliotheken', *Opuscula Archaeologica,* 3 (1944): 145–93.

Campenhausen, Han von, *The Formation of the Christian Bible* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972).

Carleton-Paget, J., 'The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 229–49.

Casey, Robert P., *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria: Edited with Translation, Introduction and Notes* (London: Christophers, 1934).

Casson, L., *Libraries in the Ancient World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).

Cavallo, Guglielmo, 'Greek and Latin Writing in the Papyri', in Roger Bagnall (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 101–48.

—— *Hellenistic Bookhands* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

—— *Il Calamo e il Papiro: la Scrittura Greca dall' età Ellenistica ai Primi Secoli di Bisanzio* (*PapFlor* 36; Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2005).

—— *Ricerche sulla Maiuscola Biblica* (*STP* 2; Florence: Le Monnier, 1967).

—— and Herwig Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period: A.D. 300–800* (Bulletin Suppl. 47; London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, 1987).

Chadwick, Henry, 'Justin Martyr's Defense of Christianity', *BJRL* 47 (1964–5): 275–97.

Chapa, Juan, '4499', *P.Oxy. LXVI,* 66: 10–37.

—— 'Los papiros más antiguos del Evangelio de Juan: Breve descripción', *EstBib* 66 (2008): 55–74.

—— 'The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Gospel of John in Egypt', *VC* 64 (2010): 327–52.

Chapman, John, 'Did the Translator of St. Irenaeus Use a Latin N.T.?', *RB* 36 (1924): 34–51.

Charlesworth, James H., and Craig A. Evans, 'Jesus in the Agrapha and Apocryphal Gospels', in Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *Studying the Historical Jesus* (NTTS 19; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 470–533.

Charlesworth, Scott D., 'Consensus Standardization in the Systematic Approach to *Nomina Sacra* in Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts', *Aeg* 86 (2006): 37–68.

—— *Early Christian Gospels: Their Production and Transmission. A Comparative Codicological, Palaeographical, and Text-Critical Study of Canonical and Non-Canonical Gospel Papyri* (Papyrologica Florentina; Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, forthcoming).

—— 'Public and Private: Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts', in Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 148–75.

—— 'T. C. Skeat, $\mathfrak{P}^{64} + {}^{67}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$, and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction', *NTS* 53 (2007): 582–604.

Chase, F. H., *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* (London: Macmillan, 1893).

—— *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1895).

Choat, Malcolm. *Belief and Cult in Fourth-Century Papyri* (Studia Antiqua Australiensia, 1; Turnhout: Brepols, 2006).

—— and R. Yuen-Collingridge, 'The Egyptian Hermas: The Shepherd in Egypt Before Constantine', in T. J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (eds.), *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach* (TENT 5; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 191–211.

Ciasca, Agostino, *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae Arabice* (Rome: Ex typographia Polyglotta, 1888).

Clabeaux, John J., *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion* (*CBQMS* 21; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989).

Clark, A. C., *The Book of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933).

Clark, K. W., *The Gentile Bias and Other Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 1980).

Clivaz, Claire, 'The Angel and the Sweat like "Drops of Blood" Luke 22:43–44: $\mathfrak{P}^{69}$ and f^{13}', *HTR* 98/4 (2005): 419–40.

—— *L'Ange et la sueur de sange (Lc 22, 43–44) ou comment on pourrait bien encore écrire l'histoire* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).

—— 'Some Remarks on Thomas A. Wayment, "A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 ($\mathfrak{P}^{69}$)"', *NovT* 52 (2010): 83–7.

Cohén, Naomi B., *Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings: Evidence for a Haftarah Cycle in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJ Sup 123; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

Colwell, Ernest C., 'Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$', in Ernest C. Colwell (ed.), *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 106–24.

—— 'Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text', in Ernest C. Colwell (ed.), *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 106–24.

—— *Studies in the Methodology of the Text Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1969).
—— *What is the Best New Testament?* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1952).
—— and Ernest W. Tune, 'Method in Establishing Textual Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts', in Ernest C. Colwell (ed.), *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 9; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 45–55.
—— and —— 'The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-Types', in J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomas (eds.), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), 25–32. Repr., Ernest C. Colwell (ed.), *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. (Leiden: Brill, 1969).
Connolly, R. H., 'Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* V.28', *JTS* 49 (1948): 73–9.
Comfort, Philip, 'New Reconstructions and Identifications of New Testament Papyri', *NovT* 41 (1999): 219–20.
—— *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2008).
—— and David P. Barrett, eds., *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: New and Complete Transcriptions with Photographs* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale, 2001).
Corssen, Peter, *Epistularum Paulinarum codices Graece et Latine scriptos Augiensem Boerneria- num Claromontanum examinavit inter se comparavit ad communem originem revocavit*, *Specimen primum* and *Specimen alterum* (Kiel: Heinrich Fiencke, 1889).
Cosaert, Carl P., *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria* (SBLNTGF 9; Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2008).
Cousland, J. R. C., 'Matthew's Earliest Interpreter: Justin Martyr on Matthew's Fulfillment Quotations', in Thomas R. Hatina (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels* (Library of New Testament Studies, 310; London: T&T Clark, 2008), 45–60.
Craigie, Peter C., *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).
Cranfield, C. E. B., *I and II Peter and Jude: Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM, 1960).
Credner, Carl August, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften* (Halle, publisher 1832).
Cribiore, Raffaella, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).
Crossan, John Dominic, *Historical Jesus*; *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1995).
—— *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988).
Crouzel, Henri, *L'Église primitive face au divorce* (Paris: Cerf, 1970).
Crum, W. E., and H. I. Bell, eds., *Coptica III: Wadi Sarga: Coptic and Greek Texts from the Excavations Undertaken by the Byzantine Research Account* (Copenhagen, 1922).
Cullmann, Oscar, 'The Tradition', in Oscar Cullman (ed.), *The Early Church* (London: SCM, 1956), 59–99.

Cunningham, Arthur, 'The New Testament Text of St. Cyril of Alexandria', 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., University of Manchester, 1995.

Daris, S., 'Papiri letterari dell' Università Cattolica di Milano, 6. Marco, Vangelo 2, 1–26', *Aeg* 52 (1972): 80–8.

Dauer, Anton, 'Zur Authentizität von LK 24,12', *ETL* 70 (1994): 294–318.

Dehandschutter, Boudewijn, 'Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: An Early Example of "Reception"', in J.-M. Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 275–91.

—— 'The New Testament and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: University Press, 2005), 395–405.

Delobel, Joel, 'Le Texte de l'Apocalypse: Problèmes de méthode', in J. Lambrecht (ed.), *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (BETL 53; Leuven: University Press, 1980), 151–66.

—— 'The Achilles' Heel of New Testament Textual Criticism', *Bijdragen, International Journal of Philosophy and Theology,* 63 (2002): 3–21.

Desjardins, M. R., 'Bauer and Beyond: On Recent Scholarly Discussions of *Hairesis* in the Early Christian Era', *SecCent* 8 (1991): 65–82.

Dewey, Joanna, 'The Survival of Mark's Gospel: A Good Story?', *JBL* 123 (2004): 495–507.

Dibelius, Martin, and Conzelmann, Hans, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972).

Diem, W., 'Alienable und inalienable Possession im Semitischen', *ZDMG* 136 (1986): 227–91.

Dinkler-von Schubert, Erika, 'ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ: Vom "Wort vom Kreuz" (1 Kor. 1,18) zum Kreuz-Symbol', in Doula Mouriki *et al.* (eds.), *Byzantine East, Latin West: Art-Historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann* (Princeton: Department of Art and Archaeology, 1995), 29–39.

Dix, T. K., 'Private and Public Libraries at Rome in the First Century', Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1986.

—— '"Public Libraries" in Ancient Rome: Ideology and Reality', *Libraries and Culture,* 29 (1994): 282–96.

—— and G. W. Houston, 'Public Libraries in the City of Rome: From the Augustan Age to the Time of Diocletian', *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome: Antiquité,* 118 (2006): 671–717.

Dortmund, A., *Romisches Buchwesen um die Zeitenwende: War T. Pomponius Atticus (110–32 v. Chr.) Verleger?* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001).

Duff, Jeremy, '𝔓46 and the Pastorals: A Misleading Consensus?', *NTS* 44 (1998): 579.

Dummond, James, 'Shepherd of Hermas', in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905), 105–23.

Dunn, J. D. G., *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Early Christianity* (London: SCM, 1990).

Dupont, F., '*Recitatio* and the Space of Public Discourse', in T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro (eds.), *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 44–59.

Dziatzko, K., 'Bibliotheken', *RE* 3 (1944): 405–24.

Edwards, Sarah Alexander, '𝔓75 under the Magnifying Glass', *NovT* 18 (1976): 190–212.
Ehrman, Bart D., 'A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts', *Bib* 70 (1989): 377–88.
—— *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels* (SBLNTGF 1; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1986).
—— 'Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence', *NovT* 29 (1987): 22–45.
—— *Misquoting Jesus: The Story behind Who Changed the Bible and Why* (San Francisco: Harper, 2005).
—— *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
—— 'The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity', in Bart D. Ehrman, and Michael W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 361.
—— 'The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century', in D. C. Parker and Christian Amphoux (eds.), *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 95–122.
—— 'The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism', in Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History: A Discussion of Methods* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 118–35.
—— 'The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence', *JBL* 106 (1987): 465–86.
—— 'The Use of the Church Fathers in New Testament Textual Criticism', in Scot McKendrick and Orlaith O'Sullivan (eds.), *The Bible as Book* (London: British Library, 2003), 155–65.
—— and Michael W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the* Status Quaestionis. *A Volume in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger* (StD 46; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).
—— Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*, i (SBLNTGF 3; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1992).
Eldridge, Lawrence A., *The Gospel Text of Epiphanius of Salamis* (NTTS, SD 41; Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1969).
Elliott, J. Keith, 'An Eclectic Textual Commentary on the Greek Text of Mark's Gospel'. Repr. in *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark: An Edition of C. H. Turner's 'Notes on Markan Usage' together with Other Comparable Studies* (Supp NovT 71; Leiden: Brill, 1993).
—— 'Changes to the Exegesis of the Catholic Epistles in the Light of the Text in the *Editio Critica Maior*', in Sang-Won (Aaron) Son (ed.), *History and Exegesis in Honor of Dr. Earle E. Ellis*, (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 324–39.
—— 'Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri', in D. C. Parker and Christian Amphoux (eds.), *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Conference June 1994* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 161–82.
—— 'Four New Papyri Containing the Fourth Gospel and their Relevance for the Apparatus Criticus', *JTS* 59 (2008): 674–8.

Elliott, J. Keith, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993).

—— ed., *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

—— 'The Distinctiveness of the Greek Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation', *JTS* NS 48 (1997): 116–24.

—— 'The *Editio Critica Maior*: One Reader's Reactions', in Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch (eds.), *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism: New Testament, Early Christian and Jewish Literature: Papers Read at a Noster Conference* (STAR, 8; Assen: van Gorcum, 2003), 129–44.

—— 'The Greek Manuscript Heritage of the Book of Acts', *FilNeo* 17 (1996): 32–50.

—— 'The Nature of the Evidence Available for Reconstructing the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century', in C.-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), 9–18.

—— 'The New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Challenge for the Twenty-First Century', *New Testament Textual Research Update,* 8 (2000): 1–14.

—— 'The Petrine Epistles in the *Editio Critica Maior*', *NovT* 42 (2000): 328–39.

—— 'The Text and Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel', in J. K. Elliot (ed.), *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark. An Edition of C. H. Turner's 'Notes on Markan Usage' together with Other Comparable Studies* (Supp NovT 71; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 103–12.

Elliott, W. J., and D. C. Parker, *The New Testament in Greek 4: The Gospel According to St. John*, ed. the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, i. *The Papyri* (NTTS 20; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

Elze, M., *Tatian und seine Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).

Engelhardt, Moritz von, *Das Christenthum Justins des Märtyrers* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1878).

Epp, Eldon J., 'Are Early New Testament Manuscripts Truly Abundant?', in David B. Capes *et al.* (eds.), *Israel's God and Rebecca's Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2008), 77–117.

—— 'Issues in the Interrelation of New Testament Textual Criticism and Canon', in Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders (ed.), *The Canon Debate: On the Origins and Formation of the Bible* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 485–515.

—— 'New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts and Letter Carrying in Greco-Roman Times', in Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 35–56.

—— *Perspectives in New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays 1962–2004* (NovTSup 116; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

—— 'The Ascension in the Textual Tradition of Luke-Acts', in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 131–45.

—— 'The Multivalence of the Term "Original Text" in New Testament Textual Criticism', *HTR* 92 (1999): 245–81.

—— 'The New Testament Papyri at Oxyrhynchus in their Social and Intellectual Context', in William L. Petersen (ed.), *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 47–68.

—— ‘The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: “Not without Honor except in their Hometown” ’, *JBL* 123/1 (2003): 5–55.

—— ‘The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament’, in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the* Status Quaestionis. *A Volume in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 3–21.

—— ‘The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission’, in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (eds.), *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (SD 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 274–97. Previously publ. in William L. Petersen (ed.), *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1989), 71–103.

—— *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966).

—— ‘The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism’, *JBL* 98 (1979): 94–8.

—— ‘Toward the Clarification of the Term “Textual Variant” ’, in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (eds.), *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Studies and Documents, 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 47–61.

—— and Gordon D. Fee, eds., *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. K. Lake (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926), i. 396.

Fantham, E., *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996).

Fee, Gordon D., ‘A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem’, *NovT* 22 (1980): 12–28.

—— ‘Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships’, *NTS* 15 (1968–9): 23–44.

—— ‘Modern Textual Criticism and the Revival of the *Textus Receptus*’, *JETS* 21 (1978): 26–7.

—— ‘Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem’, in Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff (eds.), *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text Critical Studies 1776–1976* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 154–69.

—— *Papyrus Bodmer II ($\mathfrak{P}^{66}$): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics* (SD 34; Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1968).

—— ‘$\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria’, in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (eds.), *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (SD 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 247–73.

—— ‘The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission’, *NovT* 7 (1964–5): 247–57.

—— ‘The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria’, in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (eds.), *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993). Originally publ. in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 247–73.

Fee, Gordon D., 'The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations', *Bib* 52 (1971): 357–73.

—— 'The Text of John in the Jerusalem Bible: A Critique of the use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism', *JBL* 90 (1971): 169–70.

—— 'The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the* Status Quaestionis (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 191–207.

Fehrle, F., *Das Bibliothekswesen im Alten Rom: Voraussetzungen, Bedingungen, Anfange* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1986).

Fensham, F. C., 'Common Trends in Curses of the Near Eastern Treaties and Kudurru-Inscriptions Compared with Maledictions of Amos and Isaiah', *ZAW* 75 (1963): 155–75.

Ferguson, Everett, 'Review of Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*', *JTS* 44 (1993): 691–7.

Fishbane, Michael A., 'Varia Deuteronomica', *ZAW* 84 (1972): 349–52.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., 'The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas', in Joseph A. Fitzmyer (eds.), *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1974), 355–433.

Flink, Timo, *Textual Dilemma: Studies in the Second-Century Text of the New Testament* (University of Joensuu Publications in Theology, 21; Joensuu: University of Joensuu, 2009).

Foster, Paul, 'Are there Any Early Fragments of the So-Called *Gospel of Peter*?', *NTS* 52/1 (2006): 1–28.

—— 'Recent Developments and Future Directions in New Testament Textual Criticism: Report on a Conference at the University of Edinburgh, 27 April 2006', *JSNT* 29 (2006): 229–35.

—— 'The Apology of Quadratus', in P. Foster (ed.), *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 52–62.

—— 'The Epistles of Ignatius and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 159–86.

—— 'The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch', in *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 81–107.

—— ed., *The Non-Canonical Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2008).

Frede, Hermann Josef, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964).

Gallazi, Claudio, 'P.Mil.Vogl.Inv. 1224: Novum Testamentum, Act. 2,30–37 e 2,46–3,2', *BASP* 19 (1982): 39–45.

Gamble, Harry Y., *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

—— 'Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping of the New Testament Canon', in Charles Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels: The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex* $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ (JNTS Suppl. Ser. 258; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 27–49.

—— 'Marcion and the "Canon"', in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity,* i. *Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 195–213.

Gardner-Smith, P., 'The Gospel of Peter', *JTS* 27 (1925–6): 255–71.

Garrow, Alan J. P., *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004).

Gaventa, Beverly R., and Miller, Patrick D., eds., *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God: Essays in Memory of Donald Harrisville Juel* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2005).

Geer, Thomas C., Jr., 'Analyzing and Categorizing New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Colwell Revisited', in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the* Status Quaestionis (SD 46; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 253–67.

Gelston, Anthony, *The Peshiṭṭa of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987).

Gerstinger, Hans, 'Ein Fragment des Chester Beatty-Evangelienkodex in der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Pap. graec. Vindob. 31974)', *Aeg* 13 (1933): 67–72.

Gevirtz, Stanley, 'West-Semitic Curses and the Problem of the Origins of Hebrew Law', *VT* 11 (1961): 137–58.

Glover, Richard, 'The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels', *NTS* 5 (1958): 12–29.

Gold, B. K., ed., *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas, 1982).

Gould, Ezra P., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark* (International Critical Commentary; repr. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921).

Grant, Robert M., *Heresy and Criticism* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, 1993).

Greenberg, Gillian, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah* (MPIL 13; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

Greeven, Heinrich, 'Erwägungen zur synoptischen Textkritik', *NTS* 6 (1959–60): 281–96.

—— 'Tatian and the Bible', *StPatr* 1, TU 63 (1957): 297–306.

—— and Eberhard Güting, eds., *Textkritik des Markusevangeliums* (Theologie Forschung und Wissenschaft, 11; Münster: Lit, 2005).

Gregory, Andrew F., '*1 Clement*', in P. Foster (ed.), *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 21–31.

—— '*1 Clement* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 129–57.

—— *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period Before Irenaeus* (WUNT 2/169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

—— and Christopher M. Tuckett, '*2 Clement* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 258–9.

—— and —— eds., *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Gregory, C. R., *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907).

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., '1079', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri VIII* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1914).

—— and —— '1080', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri VIII* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1914).

—— and —— '1230', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri X* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1914).

—— and —— '1597: The Acts of the Apostles XXVI', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII* (London: Egyptian Exploration Fund, 1919).

—— and —— *ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: Sayings of Our Lord* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1897).

—— and —— *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri I* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898).

—— and —— *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri IV* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904).

—— and —— *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri X* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1914).

Greschat, Katharina, 'Justins "Denkwürdigkeiten der Apostel" und das Petrusevangelium', in Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (eds.), *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Texte, Kontexte, Intertexte* (TU 158; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 197–214.

Gronewald, Michael, 'Unbekanntes Evangelium oder Evangelienharmonie (Fragment aus dem "Evangelium Egerton")', in Michael Gronewald *et al.* (eds.), *Kölner Papyri*, 6 (Papyrologica Coloniensia, 7; Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1987), 136–45.

Gryson, Roger, ed., *Apocalypsis Johannis* (VL 26/2; Freiburg: Herder, 2003).

Gundry, Robert H., *Matthew: A Commentary on his Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

Güterbock, H. G., 'Mursili's Accounts of Suppiluliuma's Dealings with Egypt', *RHA* 18 (1960): 57–63.

Haelst, Joseph van, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Série Papyrologie, 1; Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976).

Hagedorn, Dieter, 'P.IFAO II 31: Johannesapokalypse 1,13–20', *ZPE* 92 (1992): 243–7.

Hagner, Donald A., 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr', in David Wenham (ed.), *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels* (Gospel Perspectives, 5; Sheffield: JSOT, 1984), 233–68.

—— *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (NovTSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1973).

Hahneman, Geoffrey M., *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992).

Haines-Eitzen, Kim, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Handley, E. W., *et al.*, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXIV* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1997).

Hanson, Anthony T., *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

Hargis, Jeffrey W., *Against the Christians: The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic* (Patristic Studies, 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1999).

Harnack, Adolf von, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts in der Alten Kirche und im Mittelalter* (TU 1/1–2; Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1882).

—— *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* (TUGAL 45; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924).

Harrington, Daniel J., *Jude and 2 Peter* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2003).

Harrington, D. Jeffrey, 'The Reception of Walter Bauer's *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* during the Last Decade', *HTR* 73 (1980): 289–98.

Harris, J. Rendel, 'Cod. Ev. 561: Codex Algerinae Peckover', *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis,* 8/2 (1886): 79–89.

—— 'New Points of View in Textual Criticism', *ExpTim* 7 (1914): 316–34.

—— 'The First Tatian Reading in the Greek New Testament', *Expositor,* 8/23 (1922): 120–9.

Harris, W. V., *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989).

Harvey, A. E. ' "The Workman is Worthy of his Hire": Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church', *NT* 24 (1982): 209–21.

Hasitschka, M., 'Ankunft des Herrn, erste Auferstehung und Tausendjähriges Reich: Die Schlussabschnitte im Apokalypsekommentar des Victorin von Pettau und die Hinzufügung des Hieronymus', in Joseph Verheyden, Tobias Nicklas, and A. Merkt (eds.), *Interpreting Violent Texts: The Reception of the Apocalypse in the Ancient World*, ed.(NTOA; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming).

Hatzilambrou, R., 'P. Oxy. XVIII 2192 Revisited', in A. K. Bowman *et al.* (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus: A City and its Texts* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007), 282–6.

Head, Peter M., 'A Text-Critical Study of Mark 1. 1: "The Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" ', *NTS* 37 (1991): 621–9.

—— 'Is $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{67}$ the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T. C. Skeat', *NTS* 51 (2005): 450–7.

—— 'Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies in Singular Readings in P. Bodmer II ($\mathfrak{P}$66)', in Hugh A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker (eds.), *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies?* The Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on New Testament Textual Criticism (TS III/6; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008), 55–74.

—— 'Some Recently Published New Testament Papyri from Oxyrhynchus: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment,' *TynBul* 51 (2000): 1–16.

—— 'Tatian's Christology and its Influence on the Composition of the Diatessaron', *TynBul* 43 (1992): 121–37.

—— 'The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus: Textual and Reception-Historical Considerations', *TC* 13 (2008): 1–38.

—— 'The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John', *Bib* 85 (2004): 399–408.

Heckel, Theo K., *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1999).

Helderman, J., and S. J. Noorda, eds., *Early Transmission of Words of Jesus, Thomas, Tatian and the Text of the New Testament* (Amsterdam: VU-Uitgeverij, 1983).

Helmbold, William C., and Edward N. O'Neil, *Plutarch's Quotations* (Philological Monographs, 19; Oxford: American Philological Association, 1959).

Hengel, Martin, 'Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft', *NTS* 40 (1994): 321–57.

—— *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SCM, 1985).

Hengel, Martin, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000).

Hernández Jr., Juan, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi* (WUNT 2/218; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

Hilgenfeld, Adolf, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, der clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der ältesten Evangelien-Literatur* (Halle: C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1850).

—— 'Die alttestamentliche Citate Justins in ihrer Bedeutung für die Untersuchung über Seine Evangelien', *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 9 (1850): 285–439, 567–78.

Hill, Charles E., 'Intersections of Jewish and Christian Scribal Culture: The Original Codex Containing 𝔓4, 𝔓64, and 𝔓67, and its Implications', in Reidar Hvalvik and John Kaufman (eds.), *Among Jews, Gentiles, and Christians in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Oslo: Tapir Academic Press, 2011), 75–91.

—— 'Irenaeus, the Scribes, and the Scriptures: Papyrological and Theological Observations from P.Oxy 3.405', in Sara Parvis and Paul Foster, eds., *Irenaeus and his Traditions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, forthcoming).

—— 'Justin and the New Testament Writings', in Elizabeth A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 42–8.

—— 'The Debate over the Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon', *WTJ* 57 (1995): 437–52.

—— *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

—— ' "The Orthodox Gospel": The Reception of John in the Great Church Prior to Irenaeus', in Tuomas Rasimus (ed.), *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 233–300.

—— *Who Chose the Gospels? Probing the Great Gospel Conspiracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Hock, Ronald F., *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1995).

Hoek, Annewies van den, 'Clement and Origen as Sources on "Noncanonical" Scriptural Traditions during the Late Second and Earlier Third Centuries', in Gilles Dorival and Alain le Boulluec (eds.), *Origeniana Sexta: Origène et la Bible/Origen and the Bible. Actes du Colloquium Origenianum Sextum Chantilly, 30 août–3 septembre 1993* (BETL 118; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995), 93–113.

—— 'Divergent Gospel Traditions in Clement of Alexandria and Other Authors of the Second Century', *Apocrypha*, 7 (1996): 43–62.

—— 'Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods', *VC* 50 (1996): 223–43.

Hoh, Josef, *Die Lehre des heiligen Irenäus über das Neue Testament* (NTAb 7; Münster: Aschendorff, 1919).

Holmes, Michael W., 'Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 187–227.

—— *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008).
Horton, Charles, 'The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: A Find of the Greatest Importance', in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels. The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P45* (JSNTSup 258; London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 149–60.
Hoskier, Herman C., *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collations of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text Stephen's Third Edition, Together with the Testimony of the Versions, Commentaries and Fathers* (2 vols. London: B. Quaritch, 1929).
Houston, G. W., 'Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries in the Roman Empire', in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 233–67.
Huber, Konrad, 'Aspekte der Apokalypseinterpretation des Victorinus von Pettau am Beispiel der Christusvision in Offb 1', in Joseph Verheyden, Tobias Nicklas, and A. Merkt (eds.), *Interpreting Violent Texts: The Reception of the Apocalypse in the Ancient World* (NTOA; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming).
Hurtado, Larry, 'Beyond the Interlude? Developments and Directions in New Testament Textual Criticism', in D. G. K. Taylor (ed.), *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 1999), 26–47.
—— 'Early Christian Manuscripts as Artifacts', in Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 66–80.
—— *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).
—— *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark*, ed. Irving Alan Sparks (SD 43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981).
—— *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).
—— 'The Earliest Evidence of an Emerging Christian Material and Visual Culture: The Codex, the *Nomina Sacra* and the Staurogram', in Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins (eds.), *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000), 271–88.
—— 'The New Testament in the Second Century: Text, Collections and Canon', in Jeff W. Childers and D. C. Parker (eds.), *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies* (TS III/4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006), 3–27.
—— 'The Origin of the Nomina Sacra: A Proposal', *JBL* 117 (1998): 655–73.
—— 'The Staurogram in Early Christian Manuscripts: The Earliest Visual Reference to the Crucified Jesus?', in Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (eds.), in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and their World* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 207–26.
Huston, Holis W., 'Mark 6 and 11 in $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ and in the Caesarean Text', *JBL* 64 (1955): 262–71.
Iddeng, J., '*Publica aut peri!* The Releasing and Distribution of Roman Books', *SO* 81 (2006): 58–84.

Ingrams, L., *et al.*, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXXIV* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1968).

—— *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in Apologetic Context* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 64; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

—— ' "Neither Adding Nor Omitting Anything": Josephus' Promise Not to Modify the Scriptures in Greek and Latin Context', *JJS* 56 (2005): 48–65.

International Greek New Testament Project, *The Gospel According to St. Luke, Part One: Chapters 1–12* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984).

—— *The Gospel According to St. Luke, Part Two: Chapters 13–24* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987).

Irenaeus of Lyons, *Contre les heresies, Livres 1–5,* ed., tr., and annotated by Adelin, Rousseau, *et al.* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1965).

Jackson, Hershbell P., ' "Plutarch's 'De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo": An Analysis of Structure and Content', *ANRW* II/36/1 (1986): 234–47.

Jensen, Robin Margaret, *Understanding Early Christian Art* (London: Routledge, 2000).

Jerome, 'Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Marcum', *Patrologia Latina,* 30: 589–644.

Johnson, Luke T., *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (New York: Doubleday, 2001).

Johnson, William A., *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004).

—— *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

—— 'Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity', *AJP* 121 (2000): 593–627.

Jongkind, Dirk, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, ed. D. C. Parker and D. G. K. Taylor (TS III/5; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007).

Joosse, N. P. G., *The Sermon on the Mount in the Arabic Diatessaron,* PhD diss., Vrije Universiteit, 1997.

Judge, Edwin A., *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century: Pivotal Essays by E. A. Judge*, ed. David Scholer (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2008).

—— 'The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community', *JRH* 1 (1961): 4–15, 125–37.

Jülicher, Adolf, Walter Matzkow, and Kurt Aland, *Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung, I Matthäus-Evangelium* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972).

—— *II Marcus-Evangelium* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970).

—— *III Lucas-Evangelium* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976).

—— *IV Johannes-Evangelium* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963).

Junack, Klaus, and W. Grunewald, eds., *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,* i. *Die katholischen Briefe* (ANTF 6; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986).

—— *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,* ii. *Die Paulinischen Briefe,* 1: *Röm., 1. Kor., 2. Kor*. (ANTF 12; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989).

Keenan, J. G., 'A Papyrus Letter about Epicurean Philosophy', *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal,* 5 (1977): 91–4.

Keith, Chris, *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus* (NTTS 38; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

—— *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Kelhoffer, James A., *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (WUNT 2/112; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2000).

Kelly, J. N. D., *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969).

—— *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1960).

Kenyon, Frederic G., *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1926).

—— *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri,* ii. *The Gospels and Acts* (London: Walker, 1933).

—— *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible,* iii. *Pauline Epistles and Revelation* (London: Walker, 1934).

—— *The Story of the Bible: A Popular Account of How it Came to Us* (London: John Murray, 1936).

Kilpatrick, G. D., 'Professor J. Schmid on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse', *VC* 13 (1959): 1–13.

Kinzig, Wolfram, 'Der "Sitz im Leben" der Apologie in der Alten Kirche', *ZKG* 100 (1989): 291–317.

Klauck, H.-J., *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006).

Kleberg, T., 'Bucherliebhaberei und private Buchersammlungen in der romischen Kaiserzeit', in J. Mayerhofer and W. Ritzer (eds.), *Festschrift J. Stummvoll* (Vienna: Hollinek, 1970), 401–9.

—— *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967).

Kline, Leslie L., 'Harmonized Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Justin Martyr', *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* 66 (1975): 223–41.

—— *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (SBLDS 14; Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1975).

Kloppenborg, John S., 'The Use of the Synoptics or Q in Did. 1.3b–2.1', in Hubertus van de Sandt (ed.), *The Didache and Matthew: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 105–29.

Knight, George W., *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992).

Koester, Helmut, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990).

—— *Introduction to the New Testament*, ii. *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982).

—— *Septuaginta und synoptischer Erzählungsstoff im Schriftbeweis Justins des Märtyrers,* Habilitationsschrift, Heidelberg, 1956.

—— *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostlischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957).

—— 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in William L. Petersen (ed.), *The Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (CJA 3; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1989), 17–37.

Koester, Helmut, 'Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?', *JBL* 113 (1994): 293–7.
Köhler, Wolfgang-Dietrich, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (WUNT 2/24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987).
Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Michael J. Kruger, *The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Culture's Fascination with Diversity has Reshaped our Understanding of Early Christianity* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2010).
Kovacs, Judith, and Christopher Rowland, *Revelation* (Blackwell Bible Commentaries; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).
Kraeling, C. H., *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura* (St&D 3; London, Press 1935).
Kraft, Benedikt, *Die Evangelienzitate des heiligen Irenäus: Nach überlieferung und Textant untersucht* (BibS (F) 21/4; Freiburg: Herder, 1924).
Kraus, Thomas J., '*P.Vindob.G* 2325: Das sogenannte Fayûm-Evangelium—Neuedition und kritische Rückschlüsse', *ZAC/JAC* 5 (2001): 197–212. Repr. and corrected in English tr. inThomas J. Kraus, *Ad fontes: Original Manuscripts and their Significance for Studying Early Christianity. Selected Essays* (TENT 3; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 69–94.
—— 'Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Chances and Limitations', in Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (eds.), *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach* (TENTS 5; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).
—— and Tobias Nicklas, eds., *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).
—— and —— eds., *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and their World* (TENTS 2; Leiden: Brill, 2006).
—— Michael J. Kuger, and Tobias Nicklas, eds., *Gospel Fragments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
Kretschmar, Georg, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes: Die Geschichte ihrer Auslegung im 1. Jahrtausend* (Calwer Theologische Monographien, 9; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1985).
Krüger, Julian, *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit: Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1990).
Kubo, Sakae, $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$ *and Codex Vaticanus* (SandD 7; Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1965).
—— 'Textual Relationships in Jude', in J. K. Elliott (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (NovTSup 44; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 276–82.
Kümmel, Werner G., *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1973).
Lagrange, Marie Joseph, *La Critique rationelle*, ii. *Critique textuelle* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1935).
—— 'Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Épitres de S. Paul et l'Apocalypse', *RB* 43 (1934): 481–93.
Lake, Kirsopp, *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament* (Oxford: Parker & Son, 1904).
—— *The Text of the New Testament* (London: Rivingtons, 1913).
Lampe, Peter, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, tr. Michael G. Steinhauser (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003).
Lange, Armin, ' 'Nobody Dared to Add to Them, to Take from Them, or to Make Changes' (Josephus, *AG. AP*. 1.42) The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scripture

in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Anthony Hilhorst, Emile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar (eds.), *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 105–26.

Layton, Bentley, *A Coptic Grammar* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004).

Leaney, Robert, 'The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (XXIV. 12–53)', *NTS* 2 (1955/6): 110–14.

Legg, S. C. E., *Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1935).

—— *Evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940).

Leloir, Louis, *Le Témoignage d'Éphrem sur le Diatessaron* (CSCO Subs. 19; Leuven: CSCO, 1962).

—— *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant: Texte Syriac* (Chester Beatty Monographs, 8; Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1963).

—— *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant: Texte Syriaque* (Manuscrit Chester Beatty, 709, Folios Additionnels; Leuven: Peeters, 1990).

—— *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant: Version Arménienne* (Leuven: Durbecq, 1954).

Lenfant, Dominique, 'Peut-on se fier aux "fragments" d'historiens? L'Exemple des citations d'Hérodote', *Ktèma,* 24 (1999): 103–21.

Lieu, Judith, ' "As Much My Apostle as Christ is Mine": The Dispute over Paul between Tertullian and Marcion', *Early Christianity,* 1 (2010): 41–59.

Lightfoot, J. B., *The Apostolic Fathers,* part 2. *Ignatius and Polycarp,* ii (London: Macmillan, 1890; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989).

Linton, Olof, 'Evidences of a Second-Century Revised Edition of St Mark's Gospel', *NTS* 14 (1968): 321–55.

Llewelyn, S. R., *NewDocs,* vii (Sydney: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1994).

—— 'Sending Letters in the Ancient World', *TynBul* 46 (1995): 337–56.

Lobel, E., C. H. Roberts, E. G. Turner, and J. W. B. Barnes, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part XXIV* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1957).

Longenecker, Richard N., *Galatians* (Dallas, Tex.: Word, 1990).

Lührmann, Dieter, with Egbert Schlarb, *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache* (*MThSt* 59; Marburg: Elwert, 2000).

Luijendijk, AnneMarie, 'A New Testament Papyrus and its Documentary Context: An Early Christian Writing Exercise from the Archive of Leonidas (P.Oxy. II 209/$\mathfrak{P}^{10}$)', *JBL* 129 (2010): 575–96.

—— *Greetings in the Lord: Early Christians and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (HTS 60; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008).

—— 'Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus', *VC* 64 (2010): 217–54.

McArthur, Harvey K., 'The Earliest Divisions of the Gospels', in F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica,* iii/2 (TU 88; Berlin: Akademie, 1964), 266–72.

McCarthy, C., tr., *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron* (*JSS* Suppl. 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

McDonald, Lee M., *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007).

McDonnell, M., 'Writing, Copying and Autograph Manuscripts in Ancient Rome', *Classical Quarterly,* 46 (1996): 469–91.

McFall, Lesley, 'Tatian's Diatessaron: Mischievous or Misleading?', *WTJ* 56 (1994): 87–114.

Malherbe, Abraham J., *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1977).

Mara, Maria G., *Évangile de Pierre* (SC 201; Paris: Cerf, 1973).

Marmardji, A. S., *Diatessaron de Tatien* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1935).

Marshall, I. Howard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999).

Martin, A. G., 'Le Palimpseste syriaque du Sinaï et le codex de Bèze', in D. C. Parker and Christian Amphoux (eds.), *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 50.

Martin, Michael Wade, 'Defending the "Western Non-Interpolations": The Case for an Anti-Separationist *Tendenz* in the Longer Alexandrian Readings', *JBL* 124 (2005): 269–94.

Martin, Victor, and Rodolf Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV: Evangile de Luc chap. 3–24* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961).

Martini, Carlo M., *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV* (AnBib 26; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966).

Mason, Steve, 'Josephus and his Twenty-Two Book Canon', in Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 110–27.

Massaux, Édouard, *Influence de l'Évangile de Saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant Irénée* (Leuven: Presses universitaires, 1950; repr. in BETL 75; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986; English tr. *The Influence of the Gospel of Matthew on Christian Literature before Irenaeus,* New Gospel Studies, 5/1–3; Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 1992).

—— 'Le Texte de la I^{a} Petri du Papyrus Bodmer VIII ($\mathfrak{P}^{72}$)', *ETL* 39 (1963): 616–71.

—— 'Le Texte de l'Épître de Jude du Papyrus Bodmer VII', in Étienne van Cauwenbergh (ed.), *Scrinium Lovaniense* (Leuven: Louvain University Press, 1961), 108–25.

—— 'Le Texte du sermon sur la montagne utilisé par Saint Justin', *ETL* 25 (1952): 411–48.

Mayeda, Gor, *Das Leben-Jesu-Fragment: Papyrus Egerton 2 und seine Stellung in der urchiristlichen Literaturgeschichte* (Bern: Paul Haupt, 1946).

Mayor, Joseph B., *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1907).

Meade, David G., 'Ancient Near Eastern Apocalypticism and the Origins of the New Testament Canon of Scripture', in Randall Heskett and Brian Irwin (eds.), *The Bible as a Human Witness: Hearing the Word of God through Historically Dissimilar Traditions* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 302–21.

Meeks, Wayne A., *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).

Meecham, H. G., *The Epistle to Diognetus: The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Notes* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1949).

Mees, Michael, 'Das Matthäus-Evangelium in den Werken des Clemens von Alexandrien', *Div* 12/3 (1968): 675–98.

—— 'Die Bezeugung von Mt. 26,20–40 auf Papyrus (𝔓64, 𝔓53, 𝔓45, 𝔓37) und ihre Bedeutung', *Aug* 11 (1971): 409–31.
—— *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testmaent bei Clemens von Alexandrien* (Quaderni di 'Vetera Christianorum', 2; Bari: Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, Universita di Bari, 1970).
—— 'Form und Komposition der Herrenworte in Justin, Apol. 1,15–17', *Aug* 17 (1977): 283–306.
—— 'Papyrus Bodmer XIV (𝔓75) und die Lukaszitate bei Clemens von Alexandrien', *Lateranum,* 34 (1968): 97–119.
Meier, John P., 'The Inspiration of Scripture: But What Counts as Scripture?', *Mid-Stream,* 38 (1999): 77.
Merk, Augustinium, 'Der Text des Neuen Testamentes beim hl. Irenaeus', *ZKT* 49 (1925): 302–15.
—— *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine* (Rome: Graz, 1964).
Metzger, Bruce M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994).
—— 'Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts', *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian* (NTTS 8; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 101.
—— 'Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament', in Bruce M. Metzger (ed.), *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 167–88. Repr. from *NTS* 18 (1971–2): 379–400.
—— *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987).
—— *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977).
—— *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission Corruption and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968, 1993).
—— and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
Milavec, Aaron, 'Synoptic Tradition in the Didache Revisited', *JECS* 11 (2003): 443–80.
Min, Kyoung Shik, *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./.4. Jh.)* (ANTF 34; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005).
Mink, Gerd, 'Die koptischen Versionen des Neuen Testaments: Die sprachlichen Probleme bei ihrer Bewertung für die griechische Textgeschichte', in Kurt Aland (ed.), *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (ANTF 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 160–299.
—— 'Ein umfassende Genealogie der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung', *NTS* 39 (1993): 481–99.
—— 'Was verändert sich in der Textkritik durch die Beachtung genealogischer Kohärenz?', in Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch (eds.), *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism: New Testament, Early Christian and Jewish Literature. Papers Read at a Noster Conference* (*STAR,* 8; Assen: van Gorcum, 2003), 39–68.
Minns, Denis, and Parvis, Paul, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (OECT; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
Moll, Sebastian, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (WUNT 250; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

Morrill, Bruce, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987).

Moule, C. F. D., 'The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal', *BJRL* 47 (1965): 430–52.

Mugridge, Alan, 'Stages of Development in Scribal Professionalism in Early Christian Circles', Ph.D. thesis, University of New England, 2010.

—— 'What is a Scriptorium?', in J. Frösén *et al.* (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1–7 August, 2004* (*Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum,* 122/2; Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2007), 781–92.

Munier, Charles, *Justin Apologie pour les chrétiens: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes* (SC 507; Paris: Cerf, 2006).

—— *L'Apologie de saint Justin philosophe et martyr* (Paradosis, 38; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1994).

—— *Mariage et virginité dans l'Église ancienne* (Traditio christiana, 6; Bern: Lang, 1987).

—— 'La Structure littéraire de l'Apologie de Justin', *RevScRel* 60 (1986): 34–54.

Myllykoski, Matti, 'The Sinful Woman in the *Gospel of Peter*: Reconstructing the Other Side of P.Oxy. 4009', *NTS* 55/1 (2009): 104–15.

Nagel, Titus, *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert: Studien zur vorirenäischen Aneignung und Auslegung des vierten Evangeliums in christlicher und christlich-gnostischer Literatur* (Arbeiten zur Bibel und seine Geschichte, 2; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000).

Naldini, M., 'Nuovi frammenti del vangelo di Matteo', *Prometeus,* 1 (1975): 195–200.

Nasrallah, Laura S., 'The Rhetoric of Conversion and the Construction of Experience: The Case of Justin Martyr', *StPatr* 40 (2006): 467–74.

Neirynck, Frans, 'Lc. XXIV 12: Les Témoins du text occidental', in Tjitze Baarda, A. F. J. Klijn, and W. C. van Unnik (eds.), *Miscellanea Neotestamentica I* (NovTSup 47; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 45–60.

—— 'Luke 24,12: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation?', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 145–58.

—— 'Once More Luke 24,12', *ETL* 70 (1994): 319–40.

New, S., 'Note XXIII: The Michigan Papyrus Fragment 1571', in F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*, v. *Additional Notes to the Commentary* (London: Macmillan, 1933), 262–8.

Nicklas, Tobias, 'Probleme der Apokalypserezeption im 2. Jahrhundert: Eine Diskussion mit Charles Hill', in Joseph Verheyden, Tobias Nicklas, and A. Merk (eds.), *Interpreting Violent Texts: The Reception of the Apocalypse in the Ancient World* (NTOA; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming).

—— 'Rezeption und Nicht-Rezeption der Offenbarung des Johannes durch antike christliche Apokalypsen', in R. Klotz and C. Winterer (eds.), *Tot Sacramenta quot verba: Die Kommentierung der Apokalypse von den Anfängen bis zum 11. Jahrhundert* (Münster: Aschendorff, forthcoming).

—— 'The Words of the Prophecy of this Book: Playing with Scriptural Authority in the Book of Revelation', in Mladen Popovic (ed.), *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (JSJ.S 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 309–26.

Niederwimmer, Kurt, *The Didache* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998).
Nongbri, Brent, 'The Use and Abuse of 𝔓[52]: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel', *HTR* 98 (2005): 23–48.
Noorda, S. J., ed., *Essays on the Diatessaron* (Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1994).
Oberlinner, Lorenz, *Kommentar zum ersten Timotheusbrief* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1994).
Oliver, H. H., 'The Text of the Pauline Epistles in the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria', Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1966.
Olshausen, H., *Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien: Ein Versuch* (Königsberg: Unzer, 1823).
Origen, *Contra Celsum*, tr. Henry Chadwick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).
Ortiz de Urbina, Ignatio, *Vetus Evangelium Syrorum, Diatessaron Tatiani* (Madrid: CSIC, 1967).
Ortiz Valdivieso, P., 'Un nuevo fragmento siriaco del Comentario de san Efrén al Diatésaron', *SPap* 5 (1966): 7–17.
Osburn, Carroll D., 'Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism', *NovT* 47 (2005): 313–43.
—— *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis* (SBLNTGF 6; Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2004).
Otronto, Rosa, *Antiche liste di libri su papiro* (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2000).
Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905).
Pack, Roger A., *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1967).
Paget, James Carleton, 'The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Andrew Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 229–49.
Parisot, J., *Aphraatis Sapientis Persae, Demonstrationes*, *Demonstratio XXIII De Acino*, § 21 (*Patrologia Syriaca,* 1/2; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907), 1–4.
Parker, D. C., 'A Comparison between the *Text und Textwert* and the Claremont Profile Method Analyses of Manuscripts in the Gospel of Luke', *NTS* 49 (2003): 108–38.
—— 'A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Revelation', *NTS* 46 (2000): 159–74.
—— *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
—— *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
—— 'Manuscripts of John's Gospel with *Hermeneiai*', in J. W. Childers and D. C. Parker (eds.), *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies* (TS III/4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006), 48–68.
—— *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology: Collected Papers 1977–2007* (ANTF 40; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009).
—— 'The Development of the Critical Text of the Epistle of James: From Lachmann to the *Editio Critica Maior*', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, ed. (BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 317–30.

Parker, D. C., *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

—— 'The Palaeographical Debate', in D. C. Parker and Christian Amphoux (eds.), *Codex Bezae*: *Studies from the Lunel Colloquium* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 329–36.

—— D. G. K. Taylor, and M. S. Goodacre, 'The Dura Europos Gospel Harmony', in D. G. K. Taylor (ed.), *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts* (TS III/1; Birmingham: Birmingham University Press, 1999), 192–228.

Parkes, M. B., *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1993).

Parsons, Mikeal C., 'A Christological Tendency in 𝔓⁷⁵', *JBL* 105 (1986): 463–79.

—— *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context* (JSNTSup 21; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987).

Parsons, Peter J., *The City of the Sharp-Nosed Fish: Greek Lives in Roman Egypt* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007).

—— *et al.*, *Oxyrhynchus: A City and its Texts* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007).

Parvis, Merrill M., 'The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal', *JR* 32: 172.

Parvis, Sara, and Paul Foster, eds., *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007).

Pearson, B. A., 'Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Further Observations', in J. E. Goehring and J. A. Timbie (eds.), *The World of Early Egyptian Christianity: Language, Literature, and Social Context. Essays in Honor of David W. Johnson* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2007), 97–112.

—— 'Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations', in B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (SAC; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986), 132–59.

—— *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt* (SAC; New York: T&T Clark International, 2004).

Pearson, B. A. *et al.*, eds., *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).

Perrin, N., 'Hermeneutical Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels and the Question of Textual Authority', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. De Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL 163; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 599–605.

Petersen, William L., 'Patristic Biblical Quotations and Method: Four Changes to Lightfoot's Edition of *Second Clement*', *VC* 60 (2006): 389–419.

—— *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (Suppl. VC 25; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

—— 'Textual Evidence of Tatian's Dependence upon Justin's ΑΠΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ', *NTS* 36 (1990): 512–34.

—— 'Textual Traditions Examined: What the Text of the Apostolic Fathers Tells us about the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 29–46.

—— 'The Diatessaron and the Fourfold Gospel', in C. Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels. The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex 𝔓⁴⁵* (JSNTSup 30; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 50–68.

—— 'The Genesis of the Gospels', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 33–65.

—— ed., *The Gospel Traditions of the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1989).

—— 'What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach', in Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History: A Discussion of Methods* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 136–52.

Petzer, J. H., 'The History of the New Testament Text: Its Reconstruction, Significance and Use in New Testament Textual Criticism', in Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History: A Discussion of Methods* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 11–36.

Phillips, J. J., 'Atticus and the Publication of Cicero's Works', *CW* 79 (1986): 227–37.

—— 'The Publication of Books at Rome in the Classical Period', Ph.D. diss., Yale University Press, 1981.

Pickering, S. R., 'P.Macquarie Inv. 360 (+ P.Mil.Volg. Inv. 1224): Acta Apostolorum 2.30–37, 2.46–3.2', *ZPE* 65 (1986): 76–8.

—— 'The Significance of Non-Continuous New Testament Textual Materials in Papyri', in D. G. K. Taylor (ed.), *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 1999), 121–41.

Pinner, H. L., *The World of Books in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden: Sijthhoff, 1948).

Piper, Otto, 'The Nature of the Gospel According to Justin Martyr', *JR* 49 (1961): 155–68.

Pisano, Stephen, 'The Text of the New Testament', in *Prolegomena to Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1999), 27–41.

Pistelli, Ermenegildo, *Papiri greci e latini della Società Italiana* (Florence: Publicazioni della Società Italiana, 1912), i.

Plooij, D., C. A. Phillips, and A. H. A. Bakker, *The Liège Diatessaron* (London: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-maatschappij, 1963–70), vi–viii.

Porter, Calvin L., 'Papyrus Bodmer XV ($\mathfrak{P}^{75}$) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus', *JBL* 81 (1962): 363–76.

Porter, Stanley E., 'Apocryphal Gospels and the Text of the New Testament before A.D. 200', in Christian-Bernard Amphoux and J. K. Elliott (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity/Le Texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme* (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), 235–58.

—— 'Developments in the Text of Acts Before the Major Codices', in T. Nicklas and M. Tilly (eds.), *The Book of Acts as Church History: Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 31–67.

—— 'P.Oxy. 655 and James Robinson's Proposals for Q: Brief Points of Clarification', *JTS* 52/1 (2000): 84–92.

—— 'POxy II 210 as an Apocryphal Gospel and the Development of Egyptian Christianity', in Isabella Andorlini *et al.* (eds.), *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze, 23–29 agosto 1998* (Florence: Istituto Papirologico, 2001), 1095–1108.

Porter, Stanley E., 'Recent Efforts to Reconstruct Early Christianity on the Basis of its Papyrological Evidence', paper delivered at the 26th International Congress of Papyrology, University of Geneva, Switzerland, 16–21 Aug. 2010.

—— 'The Greek Apocryphal Gospels Papyri: The Need for a Critical Edition', in Bärbel Kramer *et al.* (eds.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.–19.8.1995* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1997), 795–803.

—— 'Verbal Aspect and Synoptic Relations', forthcoming.

—— 'When and How was the Pauline Canon Compiled? An Assessment of Theories', in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *The Pauline Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 95–127.

—— and Wendy J. Porter, eds., *New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments: New Editions,* i. *Text* (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 29; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

Pouderon, Bernard, 'Une œuvre fantôme: la question de l'unicité de l'Apologie reconsidérée', *Rivista di Storia del Cristianismo,* 5 (2008): 451–72.

Price, William C., 'The Textual Relationships of Quotations from the Four Gospels in Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*', Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.

Prigent, Pierre, 'Les Citations des évangiles chez Justin (Apologie 14–17)', in Pierre Maraval (ed.), *Lectures anciennes de la Bible* (Cahiers de la Biblia Patristica, 1; Strasbourg: CADP, 1987), 137–52.

Quek, Tze-Ming, 'A Text-Critical Study of John 1.34', *NTS* 55 (2009): 22–34.

Quinn, Kenneth, 'The Poet and his Audience in the Augustan Age', *ANRW* II.30.1 (1982), 75–180.

Quispel, Gilles, 'Marcion and the Text of the New Testament', *VC* 52 (1998): 349–60.

Racine, Jean-François, *The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea* (SBLNTGF 5; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 2004).

Rad, Gerhard von, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966).

Räisänien, Heikki, 'Marcion', in Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen (eds.), *A Companion to Second-Century Heretics* (Suppl. VC 76; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2005), 100–24.

Raquel, Sylvie Taconnet, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen', Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002.

Rees, Brinley R., 'Christian Fragment', in Brinley R. Rees, H. I. Bell, and J. W. B. Barns (eds.), *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Wilfred Merton*, ii (Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1959), 1–4.

Reichmann, F., 'The Book Trade at the Time of the Roman Empire', *Library Quarterly,* 8 (1938): 40–76.

Reicke, Bo, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude* (New York: Doubleday, 1964).

Revell, E. J., 'The Oldest Evidence for the Hebrew Accent System', *BJRL* 54 (1971): 214–22.

Reynolds, L. D., and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974).

Richards, E. R., *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (WUNT 42; Tubingen: Mohr, 1991).

Richards, W. L., 'Test Passages *or* Profiles: A Comparison of Two Text-Critical Methods', *JBL* 115/2 (1996): 251–69.

—— *The Classification of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles* (SBLDS 35; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1977).

Riddle, Donald W., 'Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline', *ATR* 18 (1936): 221–7.

Rius-Camps, Josep, and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae* (4 vols. *LNTS JSNT* 257, 302, 365, 415; New York: T&T Clark, 2004–9).

Roberts, Colin H., 'An Early Papyrus of the First Gospel', *HTR* 46 (1953): 233–7.

—— *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935).

—— 'An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library', *BJRL* 20 (1936): 44–55.

—— 'Books in the Graeco-Roman World and in the New Testament', in Peter R. Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans (eds.), *From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 48–66.

—— *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Christian Egypt* (Schweich Lectures, 1977; London: Oxford University Press, 1979).

—— 'Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester', *BJRL* 20 (1936): 227.

—— and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1985).

Robinson, Maurice A., 'Review of Philip W. Comfort and David P. Barrett, eds. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: A Corrected, Enlarged Edition of* The Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts', *TC* 6 (2001): 39–50: http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/vol07–toc.html.

Robinson, Thomas A., *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1988).

Roca-Puig, Ramón, *Un Papiro Griego del Evangelio de San Mateo* (Barcelona: Grafos S.A., 1962).

Römer, Cornelia Eva, '7.64: Gemeinderbrief, Predict oder Homilie über den Menschen im Angesicht des Jüngsten Gerichts', in Cornelia E. Römer and Traianos Gagos (eds.), *Michigan Texts Published in Honor of Ludwig Koenen* (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1996), 35–43.

Ropes, James H., *The Beginnings of Christianity,* i. *The Acts of the Apostles*, 3. *The Text of Acts* (London: Macmillan, 1926).

Roth, Dieter T., 'Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion's Gospel?', *VC* 63 (2009): 429–67.

—— 'Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate', *JBL* 127 (2008): 513–27.

—— 'Marcion's Gospel: Relevance, Contested Issues, and Reconstruction', *ExpTim* 121 (2010): 287–94.

—— 'Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*', *JTS* 59 (2008): 580–97.

—— 'Towards a New Reconstruction of the Text of Marcion's Gospel: History of Research, Sources, Methodology, and the Testimony of Tertullian', Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 2009.

Royalty, Jr., Robert M., 'Justin's Conversion and the Rhetoric of Heresy', *StPatr* 40 (2006): 509–14.

Royse, James R., *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (NTTS 36; Leiden: Brill, 2008).
Runia, David T., *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993).
—— 'The Text of the Platonic Citations in Philo of Alexandria', in Mark Joyal (ed.), *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition: Essays Presented to John Whittaker* (Sydney: Ashgate, 1997), 261–91, at 261.
Ryle, Herbert E., *Philo and Holy Scripture, or, The Quotations of Philo from the Books of the Old Testament* (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895).
Saller, R. P., 'Martial on Patronage and Literature', *CQ* 33 (1983): 246–57.
—— *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
Salonius, A. H., 'Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des Neuen Testaments in den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin', *ZNW* 26 (1927): 97–119.
Sanday, William C., *The Gospels in the Second Century: An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work Entitled 'Supernatural Religion'* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1875).
—— C. H. Turner, and Alexander Souter, eds., *Novum Testamentum Sancti Episcopi Lugdenensis* (Latin Biblical Texts, 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1923).
Sanders, Henry A., 'An Early Papyrus Fragment of the Gospel of Matthew in the Michigan Collection', *HTR* 19 (1926): 215–26.
—— 'A Papyrus Fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection', *HTR* 20 (1927): 1–19.
—— 'A Third Century Papyrus of Matthew and Acts', in R. P. Casey, S. Lake, and A. K. Lake (eds.), *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends* (London: Christophers, 1937), 151–61.
Sanders, Joseph N., *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943).
Scarvelis Constantinou, E., *Andrew of Caesarea and the Apocalypse in the Ancient Church of the East,* 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., University of Laval, 2008.
Schäfer, Karl T., 'Die Zitate in der lateinischen, Irenäusübersetzung und ihr Wert für die Textgeschichte des Neuen Testaments', in Nikolaus Adler (ed.), *Vom Wort des Lebens: Festschrift Für Max Meinertz zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres 19. Dezember 1950* (NTAbh, suppl. 1; Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1951), 50–9.
Scheil, Vincent, 'Fragments de l'Évangile selon saint Luc, recueillis en Égypte', *RB* (1892): 113–15.
Schmid, Josef, 'Der Apokalypsetext des Chester Beatty 𝔓.^{47}', *ByzNeugr.Jb* 11 (1934): 81–108.
—— 'Der Apokalypsetext des Kodex 207 (Papiri della Società Italiana 1166)', *BZ* 23 (1935–6): 187–9.
—— *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes* (3 vols. Munich: Zink, 1955–6).
Schmid, Ulrich, 'How Can we Access Second Century Gospel Texts? The Cases of Marcion and Tatian', in Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000/ Le Texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme: Actes du colloque de Lille, juillet 2000* (HTB 6; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), 139–50.

—— *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe* (ANTF 25; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).

—— 'Review of Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*', *TC* 7 (2002): http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/vol07–toc.html.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *Das Johannesevangelium* (4 vols. HTKNT 4; Freiburg: Herder, 1965).

Schoedel, William R., *Ignatius of Antioch* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1985).

Schofield, Ellwood M., 'The Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament', Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1936.

Schubart, Wilhelm, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Romern* (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1962).

Schubert, Hans von, *The Gospel of St. Peter: Synoptical Tables, with Translation and Critical Apparatus*, tr. John Macpherson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1893).

Schwartz, Eduard, *Eusebius Werke II, 3: Die Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag GmbH, 1999).

Schwartz, Jacques, 'Papyrus et tradition manuscrite', *ZPE* 4 (1969): 175–82.

Semisch, Karl, *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justinus* (Hamburg: Perthes, 1848).

Shepherd, David, 'Rendering "Flesh and Bones": Pair Reversal and the Peshitta of Job 2.5', *Aramaic Studies,* 3 (2005): 205–13.

Sherwin-White, A. N., *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966).

Skarsaune, Oskar, 'Justin and his Bible', in Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 53–76.

—— *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1987).

Skeat, Theodore C., 'A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus I Codex of the Gospels and Acts', *Herm* 155 (1993): 27–43.

—— 'The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine', *JTS* 50 (1999): 583–625.

—— 'The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?', *NTS* 43 (1997): 1–34.

—— 'The Origin of the Christian Codex', *ZPE* 102 (1994): 263–8.

—— 'The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book-Production', *PBA* 42 (1956): 179–208.

—— and Brian C. McGing, 'Notes on Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus I (Gospels and Acts)', *Hermanthena,* 150 (1991): 21–5.

Snodgrass, Klyne, 'Western Non-Interpolations', *JBL* 91 (1972): 369–79.

Soden, Hermann F. von, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (4 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–13).

Sommer, Richard, 'T. Pomponius Atticus und die Verbreitung von Ciceros Werken', *Hermes,* 61 (1926): 389–422.

Souter, Alexander, 'The New Testament Text of Irenaeus', in *Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis*, ed. W. Sanday and C. H. Turner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923), p. cxii.

Stanley, Christopher D., 'Paul and Homer: Greco-Roman Citation Practice in the First Century CE', *NovT* 32 (1990): 48–78.

Stanley, Christopher D., *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Stanton, Graham N., *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

—— 'Jesus Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus', in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL 163; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 353–70.

—— 'The Fourfold Gospel', *NTS* 43 (1997): 317–46.

Starr, R., 'The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World', *CQ* 37 (1987): 213–23.

Strange, W. A., 'The Sons of Sceva and the Text of Acts 19.14', *JTS* 38 (1987): 97–106.

—— 'The Text of Acts 19.1', *NTS* 38 (1992): 145–8.

—— *The Problem of the Text of Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Strecker, Georg, 'Eine Evangelienharmonie bei Justin und Pseudoklemens?', *NTS* 24 (1978): 297–316.

—— 'The Reception of the Book', in Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Early Christianity*, ed. R. A. Kraft and tr. G. Krodel (Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 286–316.

Strycker, Émile de, *La Forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques* (SHG 33; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961).

Sturz, Harry A., *The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism* (Nashville, Tenn.: Nelson, 1984).

Suggs, Marion J., 'The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text', *NTS* 4 (1957): 139–47.

Summers, Ray, *The Secret Sayings of the Living Jesus* (Waco, Tex.: Word, 1968).

Swanson, Reuben, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John* (4 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Swete, Henry B., ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤ Α ΠΕΡΟΝ*: The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1893).

—— *The Gospel According to St. Mark*: *The Greek Text* (London: Macmillan, 1909).

Tasker, R. V. G., 'The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Apocalypse of John', *JTS* 50 (1949): 60–8.

Taylor, R. A., *The Peshiṭta of Daniel* (MPIL 7; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

Tertullian, *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera* (2 vols. CCSL 1 and 2; Turnhout: Brepols, 1954).

Testuz, Michel, *Papyrus Bodmer,* v. *Nativité de Marie* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1958).

Thiede, Carsten P., 'Papyrus Magdalen 17 (Gregory-Aland $\mathfrak{P}^{64}$): A Reappraisal', *ZPE* 105 (1995): 13–20.

Thomas, A., 'Justins literarisches Verhältnis zu Paulus und zum Johannisevangelium', *ZWT* 18 (1875): 383–412, 490–565.

Thompson, M. B., 'The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation', in Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for all Christians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 49–70.

Timpanaro, Sebastiano, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method,* ed. and tr. Glenn W. Most (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2005).

Tischendorf, Constantin, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Leipzig: Avenarius & Mendelssohn, 1853).

—— *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Editio Octava; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869).

Titus, Eric Lane, *The Motivations of Changes Made in the New Testament by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria: A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation,* Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1942.

Tollinton, R. B., *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism* (2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1914).

Tov, E., *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

Trebilco, Paul, *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (WUNT 166; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

Tregelles, S. P., *The Greek New Testament* (London: Samuel Bagster, 1857–79).

Treu, Kurt, 'Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente der Berliner Papyrussammlung', *APF* 18 (1966): 23–38.

Trobisch, David, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).

—— *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).

—— *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Tuckett, Christopher M., 'How Early is "the" "Western" Text of Acts?', in Tobias Nicklas and M. Tilly (eds.), *The Book of Acts as Church History: Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 69–86.

—— '"Nomina Sacra": Yes and No?', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL 98; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 431–58.

—— 'The *Didache* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 83–128.

—— 'The Sons of Sceva (Acts 19, 13–16) and the Narrative of Luke-Acts: A Text-Critical Study', in E. Steffek and Y. Bourquin (eds.), *Raconter, interpreter, annoncer: Festschrift Daniel Marguerat*, ed. (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2003), 305–13.

Turner, Eric G., *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Suppl. 46; London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1971, 1987).

—— *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968, 1980).

—— 'Scribes and Scholars', in A. K. Bowman *et al.* (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus: A City and its Texts* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007), 258–9.

—— *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1977).

Unnik, W. C van, '*Ηκαινὴ διαθήκη*' A Problem in the Early History of the Canon', *StPatr* 4 (1961): 212–27.

—— 'De la régle '*Μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν*' dans l'histoire du canon', *VC* 3 (1949): 1–36.

Vaganay, Léon, *L'Évangile de Pierre* (Paris: Gabalda, 1930).

Verheyden, Joseph, 'Assessing Gospel Quotations in Justin Martyr', in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 361–77.

Verheyden, Joseph, 'The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute', in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 487–556.

—— 'The *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament', in Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 293–329.

Vitelli, Girolamo, and G. Mercati, '1165. Act. Apost. 23 11–29', in Girolamo Vitelli *et al.* (eds.), *Papyri greci e latini della Societa Italiana* (Florence: Publishing Istituto papirologico, 1932), x. 112–18.

Vogels, Heinrich J., 'Der Evangelientext des hl. Irenaeus', *RB* 36 (1924): 21–33.

—— *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, Pars Prima: Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1949).

Völker, W., 'Walter Bauer's *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*', tr. T. P. Scheck, *JECS* 14 (2006): 399–405; *ZKG* 54 (1935): 628–31.

Volkmar, Gustav, *Über Justin den Märtyrer und sein Verhältniss zu unsern Evangelien* (Zürich, 1853).

Wachtel, Klaus, *Der byzantinische Text der katholischen Briefe* (ANTF 24; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).

—— '$\mathfrak{P}^{6467}$: Fragmente des Matthäusevangeliums aus dem 1. Jahrhundert?', *ZPE* 107 (1995): 73–80.

—— and Klaus Witte, *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*, ii. *Die Paulinischen Briefe,* 2. *Gal, Eph, Phil, Kol, 1 u. 2 Thess, 1 u. 2 Tim, Tit, Phlm, Hebr* (ANTF 22; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994).

Wallace-Hadrill, A., ed., *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London: Routledge, 1989).

Wartelle, André, *Bibliographie historique et critique de saint Justin, philosophe et martyre, et des apologistes grecs du IIe siècle, 1494–1994, avec un supplement* (Paris: Lanore, 2001).

Wasserman, Tommy, 'A Textual Analysis of $\mathfrak{P}^{4}$ and $\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}$', SBL Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Ga., 22 Nov. 2010.

—— 'Criteria for Evaluating Readings in New Testament Textual Criticism', in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (NTTS; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

—— '𝔓78 (P. Oxy. XXXIV 2684): The Epistle of Jude on an Amulet?', in Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (eds.), *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and their World* (TENTS 2; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 137–60.

—— *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission* (ConBNT; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2006).

—— 'The Implications of Textual Criticism for Understanding the "Original Text" ', in Eva-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson (eds.), *Mark and Matthew: Text and Contexts* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

Wayment, Thomas A., 'A New Transcription of P.Oxy. 2383 (𝔓69)', *NovT* 50 (2008): 351–7.

Weijenbourg, R., 'Meliton de Sardes lecteur de la première Apologie et du Dialogue de Saint Justin', *Anton,* 49 (1974): 362–6.

Wendel, C., 'Bibliothek', *RAC* 2 (1954): 246–74.

Wessely, Karl, 'Le Fragment relatif au reniement de Saint Pierre appartenant a la collection de l'Archiduc Rainer', in Karl Wessely (ed.), *PO 4.2: Les Plus Anciens Monuments du Christianisme écrits sur papyrus* (PO 4; Paris: Firmin-Didot 1908), 173–7.

Westcott, Brooke Foss, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1855, 1870).

—— and John Fentonand Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix* (Cambridge and London: Macmillan & Co., 1881, 1896).

—— and —— *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek with Notes on Selected Readings* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988; Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock, 2003).

White, Peter, '*Amicitia* and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome', *JRS* 68 (1978): 74–92.

—— 'Bookshops in the Literary Culture of Rome', in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 268–87.

Whittaker, John, 'The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation', in John Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts: Papers Given at the Twenty-Third Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto 6–7 November 1987* (New York: AMS Press, 1989), 63–95.

Wichelhaus, Johann, *De Novi Testamenti Versione Syriaca Antiqua quam Peschitho Vocant, Libri Quattuor* (Halle: Orphanotropheum, 1850).

Wilcox, Max, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965).

Williams, David S., 'Marcion's Gospel: Reconsidered', MA thesis, University of Georgia, 1982.

—— 'Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel', *JBL* 108 (1989): 477–96.

Williams, Peter J., 'An Evaluation of the Use of the Peshitta as a Textual Witness to Romans', *TC* 13 (2008): 3.

—— 'Bread and the Peshitta in Matthew 16: 11–12 and 12:4', *NovT* 48 (2001): 331–3.

—— *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (TS III/2; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2004).

—— 'On the Representation of Sahidic within the Apparatus of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*', *Journal of Coptic Studies,* 8 (2006): 123–5.

—— 'Some Problems in Determining the *Vorlage* of Early Syriac Versions of the NT', *NTS* 47 (2001): 537–43.

—— *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings,* Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1997; repr. as *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

Windisch, Hans, 'Der Barnabasbrief', *Die Apostolischen Väter* iii (HNT Ergänzungsband; Tübingen: Mohr, 1920), 219–413.

Wisse, Frederik, 'The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels', in William L. Petersen (ed.), *The Gospel Traditions of the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1989), 39–53.

Wisse, Frederik, 'The Use of Early Christian Literature as Evidence for Inner Diversity and Conflict', in C. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr. (eds.), *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986), 177–90.

Wright, Leon E., *Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century* (Harvard Historical Monographs, 26; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952).

Zahn, Theodor von, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (2 vols. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1888–92).

—— *Tatians Diatessaron* (FGKN 1; Erlangen: Deichert, 1881).

—— 'Zu Tatians Diatessaron', in Theodor Zahn (ed.), *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons,* ii/2 (Leipzig: Deichert, 1892), 530–50.

Zuntz, Günther, 'Reconstruction of One Leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P^{45})', *Chronique d'Egypte,* 26 (1951): 191–211.

—— 'The Text of the Epistles', in Günther Zuntz (ed.), *Opuscula Selecta: Classica, Hellenistica, Christiana* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972), 252–68.

—— *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (Schweich Lectures, 1946; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953).

Zwiep, A. W., 'The Text of the Ascension Narratives (Luke 24: 50–53; Acts 1: 1–2, 9–11)', *NTS* 42 (1996): 219–44.

Index of Biblical Citations

Mark

Luke

John

Index of Greek Manuscripts

New Testament Papyri

Other Papyri

New Testament Uncials

New Testament Minuscules

Subject Index